



THE

AMERICAN

BC

CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

REVIEW.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.

S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XIII.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1888.

PHILADELPHIA:
HARDY & MAHONY,
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

COPYRIGHT, 1888,

BY

HARDY & MAHONY.

70746

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XIII.—JULY, 1888.—No. 51.

THE LATEST HISTORIAN OF THE INQUISITION.

A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages. By Henry Charles Lea, author of “An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy,” “Superstition and Force,” “Studies in Church History.” In three volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1888.

THIS work, just issued from the press, is professedly an original and important contribution to the history of a stirring age of the world. A few natural and even necessary questions must be asked of it by all who would seek truth from its pages. These questions must be answered mainly from the historian’s own words. It is not, indeed, the man personally, but the writer’s value as a teacher of history, that is concerned.

First, has he sought the truth himself—impartially—or is he an offensive partisan likely to surprise the good faith of his reader?

Then, has he had ready to his hand the necessary sources from which to form his judgment, and does his method of writing draw from these sources evidence that will allow the reader to check off the judgments proposed to his assent?

Finally, is the historian competent to deal with the material he has gathered, and to place it before the student?

It is clear that an answer to such questions cannot be expected from the current criticism of newspapers and periodicals which,

when not inspired by the publishers of the work, will too often mistake bulk for fulness, or, as it has been put, "the stolid for the solid."

There is double need of questioning when the period of history is bound up with controversies still living and drawing minds violently to contrary sides. The history of the Middle Ages—and more than all else of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages—is a strong case in point. Three hundred years ago the Homilies of the Anglican Church declared those ages part of a "diabolical millennium." A leading Catholic convert from the Anglicanism of our own day has popularized them under the name of "Ages of Faith," seeing in them, far from any diabolical action, only the realization of Christ's beatitudes on earth.¹ There is surely sufficient latitude between these extremes to warrant caution in accepting the work of any historian on a period so largely in dispute.

In a late number of this REVIEW we attempted to go over the whole history of the Inquisition as it has been treated in anti-Catholic controversy during the last three hundred years.² We thought ourselves justified in styling this treatment an "odious mythology." We still think so after reading the volumes of Mr. Lea—more pretentious than any which have yet appeared on this subject. We are far from ranking him at once in the number of the mythologists; but we find in his pages the most exact fulfilment of certain reasons, given by us at the close of our previous study, why a Catholic, or, indeed, any lover of historic truth, cannot hope to find a satisfactory treatment of the subject from the average non-Catholic historian. These reasons are in direct connection with the questions spoken of above. We now purpose applying them as tests of historic truth to these three first volumes of Mr. Lea. We may then wait securely for the other volumes he promises us on the Spanish and later Inquisition.

The reasons we gave are "that the [historian] in question is not at all likely to possess the necessary training in theological terms and canon law to understand the very documentary evidence in his hands." Then there is "the strange ignorance, almost sure to be found, of the piety and higher influence of religion in the age whose history is in question." Thirdly, "so rare is an entire absence of prejudice that the facts themselves, known only in part as they are, will regularly take on a color not their own, but due to the jaundiced eye of the observer." "Besides all this," we added, "the essential elements of the ecclesiastical problem will regularly be missed." We ventured to conclude that "another of the immediate and most general results reached by the Catholic

¹ Kenelm H. Digby, *Mores Catholici, or Ages of Faith.*

² October, 1887, p. 691.

student who has carefully gone over this ground is a well-founded distrust of much pretentious historical research."

I.

Mr. Lea has foreseen from the start the difficulty of his work. In his preface he calls it "a history treating of a subject which has called forth the fiercest passions of man, arousing alternately his highest and basest impulses." He even anticipates a close examination. "I beg the reader to believe that the views presented have not been hastily formed, but that they are the outcome of a conscientious survey of all the original sources accessible to me." "I have sought to present an impartial account of the institution as it existed during the earlier period." He seems specially to disclaim any fellowship with those historians who have used the Inquisition as a convenient weapon of attack on the Roman Catholic Church of the present day. "The Inquisition was not an organization arbitrarily devised and imposed upon the judicial system of Christendom by the ambition or fanaticism of the Church. It was rather a natural—one may almost say an inevitable—evolution of the forces at work in the thirteenth century, and no one can rightly appreciate the process of its development and the results of its activity without a somewhat minute consideration of the factors controlling the minds and souls of men during the ages which laid the foundation of modern civilization. To accomplish this it has been necessary to pass in review nearly all the spiritual and intellectual movements of the Middle Ages, and to glance at the condition of society in certain of its phases." This is almost enough to disarm the incautious. If faithfully carried out it would go far toward answering the question concerning the sufficiency of the historical material in the writer's hands, quite apart from the publisher's assurance that "for fifteen years he has been collecting material for it—material which has grown enormously through the well-directed researches of recent scholars, and which has not hitherto been co-ordinated and utilized for such purpose."

Besides, Mr. Lea claims special competence from his examination of the jurisprudence of the period, "which presents without disguise its aspirations and the means regarded as best adapted for their realization." Finally, though he maintains that "no serious historical work is worth the writing or the reading unless it conveys a moral," yet he promises that the moral shall "develop itself in the mind of the reader without being obtruded upon him."¹

Unfortunately, we Catholics have a long and grievous experience of morals thus left to develop themselves in the minds of readers.

¹ Vol. i., Preface.

We ask impartiality from the historian, not as a man, but as a writer. We have no right to go beyond his words as they stand. But we have every right to demand that the writer shall not take for granted certain fundamental principles that give their own interpretation to all the facts he may bring forward ; that he shall not insinuate his own party feeling along with his description of the facts, by that rhetorical process which results, according to Cicero, in building up living flesh and blood round dry bones ; and, that he shall not group his facts after the manner of a special pleader, so that true facts by an artificial order lead up to a false conclusion. Of course, the old idea of history, which Quintilian said is written for narration and not for proof, long since passed away. We are now only too thankful when the moral of an historical work, to use Mr. Lea's happy phrase, "is not obtruded upon us." But we also desire not to be cheated into accepting as true what is only the result of a juggling arrangement of facts. Gibbon wrote more volumes than Mr. Lea on a subject scarcely more vast ; and from beginning to end there is neither break nor halt in his skilful and concealed argumentation against the divine origin of Christianity. Mr. Lea, with his heaviness of style and absence of rhetorical movement, is certainly not a Gibbon ; it remains to be seen whether in his anxiety to convey a moral he has not followed the illegitimate method of the more brilliant writer. He says himself, "I have not paused to moralize, but I have missed my aim if the events narrated are not so presented as to teach their appropriate lesson."¹ So much morality and so many lessons have been drawn from the Middle Ages and the Inquisition for the special benefit of Catholics that we may well look closely into the state of mind of our new teacher.

The non-Catholic student of history is equally interested with ourselves in this examination if he sincerely desires to know the truth in the matter ; or if, as Schiller puts it in words which men of science love to quote in their own controversies,—*he prefers truth to his system.* Let him remove for a moment from his mind the ever present phantom of the Church of Rome ; for that Church is so living that she is sure to awaken either violent hatred or enthusiasm—even when there is question of ages considered dark. It is an undoubtedly dark legate of the Abyssinian Church—of which no one has any great knowledge and for which consequently no one feels any great degree of love or hatred—that claims his attention. He comes with much semi-barbaric strangeness and ceremony to complain of the injustice of historians. Neither Gibbon nor Mr. Lea can refuse to hear him on this score. But some victim of negrophobia will say to this representative of the

¹ Preface.

Ethiopic Church : " Why should I listen to you ? It is plain upon your face that you represent an odious institution. How else comes it that you and all your brethren are so black ? "

The Ethiop, in the name of his Church, simply desires to prove in the language of the spouse of the Canticles—*I am black but beautiful*—and he answers with many an apologetic salaam—*Do not consider me that I am brown, because the sun hath altered my color.*¹

The anti-Ethiop retorts—" Well, if your faith is not the cause of the black skins among you, at any rate you behaved very badly in the time of King Theodore, when so enlightened a nation as England had to send out its army to whip you into submission. It is clear your Church is an enemy of civilization. And then I have a choice set of nasty anecdotes about you and the Italians, with ' its continuance to modern times.' "²

The oriental, imperturbable as is his race, bows low once more and protests that the Abouna and his assistant bishops ought not to be held responsible for fighting that began in English calicoes and African slaves and elephants' teeth. He even goes on to say, with a pathos that should move to thought every lover of truth : " Not all the children of the Abyssinian Church are worthy representatives of her faith; for, indeed,—*the sons of my mother have fought against me.*" In fact, the dark-skinned legate might well protest that the historian should follow out the late Mr. Bagehot's clever turn of thought, and remember that there is a " connective tissue " of civilization, based in " Physics and Politics " quite as much as in religion ; and, he who desires to know the truth concerning the part played by a religious faith or a church in any period of the world's history, must carefully seek out what is really owing to its action on the age, and not lay to its charge results which it could not be expected to prevent or change. Keeping this view of the case steadily before us, we may profitably examine Mr. Lea's impartiality and competency as an historian.

It is comforting to notice that the Church for him is usually " It," and only on exciting occasions " She."³ Too often, from beginning to end of some pretended historical study, the Church is nothing less than a horrid and preternatural harridan exercising her cruelty and her witchcraft through all the ages. This view, it is true, is in its way a direct testimony to the one and continuous personality of the Church, constituted, as all Catholics hold, by the ever present assistance of the same one Holy Spirit of

¹ Canticles, i , 4, 5.

² Mr. Lea's phrase of the Church's legislation " compelling the chastity " of its " ministers," i., 31.

³ As in chapter on *The Stake*, i., 536.

God. To them she is the mighty mother whom Christ has loved —a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but holy and without blemish.¹

The enemies of the Catholic Church who have consciously acknowledged this personality, are forced to attribute it to some spirit of evil; and for this reason the Church was so long stigmatized by them as the anti-Christ. It is curious to note, now that men of science have rejected both Christ and the devil, how all unconsciously they continue to acknowledge this personality of the Church, persevering on the same from age to age, in their bitterest attacks against her. It is this we wished to express by the word "mythology," finding it best exemplified, in this "scientific" phase, in a work of the late Prof. Draper that—professedly in behalf of science—deals largely with the same period which has occupied the leisure of Mr. Lea.

Mr. Lea devotes his first, and what for many will be the principal, chapter of his work, to the Church's position "as the twelfth century drew to a close." On the one hand, he declares that "the vicissitudes of one hundred and fifty years, skilfully improved, had rendered it the mistress of Christendom." Of her priests he says, "over soul and conscience their empire was complete." There had been "created a spiritual despotism which placed all things within reach of him who could wield it." "The papal mandate, just or unjust, reasonable or unreasonable, was to be received and implicitly obeyed, for there was no appeal from the representative of St. Peter." "The destiny of all men lay in the hands which could administer or withhold the sacraments essential to salvation." "The Church militant was an army encamped on the soil of Christendom, with its outposts everywhere, subject to the most efficient discipline, animated with a common purpose, every soldier" (Mr. Lea by this means only the members of the clergy) "panoplied with inviolability and armed with the tremendous weapons which slew the soul." "That [the Pope] was supreme over all the earth—over pagans and infidels as well as over Christians—was legally proved and universally taught by the mediæval doctors."² On the other hand, "if the Church, by sundering itself completely from the laity, had acquired the services of a militia devoted wholly to itself, it had thereby created an antagonism between itself and the people. Practically, the whole body of Christians no longer constituted the Church; that body was divided into two essentially distinct classes,

¹ Ephesians, v., 24, 27.

² It would be curious to know what Mr. Lea imagines Innocent III. to have meant by "pronouncing himself to be the God of Pharaoh." The Vulgate Bible (Exodus, vii., 1) has—*The Lord said to Moses: Behold, I have appointed thee the God of Pharaoh*—surely no great usurpation of the place of the divinity.

the shepherds and the sheep; and the lambs were often apt to think, not unreasonably, that they were tended only to be shorn."

This, put forward in an initial statement of principles to be received by the reader and for which no real proof is offered, seems wonderfully like the old Protestantism; not to say that no Catholic would admit the truth of a single one of these propositions. They can be disproved from the very mediæval doctors Mr. Lea so confidently quotes.¹ But there is worse yet to come, not once or by the way, but everywhere and to the end. His entire book is to speak of the modes "in which the supreme jurisdiction of Rome worked inestimable evil throughout Christendom." And when finally he has fully entered on his own particular subject, he declares, in a most general and sweeping proposition, that the Church "has always held the toleration of others to be persecution of itself;" and "the Church was responsible for the enactment of the ferocious laws punishing heresy with death."²

It is already plain that Mr. Lea holds a brief against the Roman Catholic Church of all ages. From her history during the Middle Ages he is to furnish the material for a studied attack all along the line; first, against her divine origin and her character as the Church of Christ;³ secondly, against the part she has played in the civilization of the world; and finally, to throw upon her the opprobrium of religious intolerance and persecution exercised by her as a Church, all to be burned into the anti-Catholic imagination by the most lurid accumulation of facts possible.

The merely apparent fairness of certain general propositions scattered through the work cannot soften this judgment of it as a whole. That the Church was pushed on in her evil courses by the spirit of the age does not do away with the charges against her. If there is a divine assistance guarding her from age to age, she cannot thus utterly fall away, even though many of her children may cease to be guided by her spirit. That the net result of all the selfish grasping and deliberate cruelty charged upon her was in sum total an advantage to the world and civilization, can also in no wise clear the Church from the fundamental accusations brought against her. Mr. Lea cannot suppose the human instruments in which the Church's authority was centred, to have foreseen the

¹ See especially the Decretal of Innocent III., *Per venerabilem* (A.D. 1202), with the comments of all canonists on iv., 17, *Qui filii sint legitimi*, under which title this stands as c. 13; also theologians on Boniface VIII. (c. 4, iii., 20, in 6).

² i., 1, 2, 4, 5, 18, 135, 536.

³ The last chapter but one of his entire work (iii., 550-615) is a disquisition on *Intellect and Faith*. Into this he has introduced a polemical tract on the *Inmaculate Conception!* The choice mess he has made of it would be beneath contempt, did it not show so clearly Mr. Lea's starting point in his researches, namely, that the Catholic intellect has no rights which non-Catholics are bound to respect.

good likely to result from the evil he so exaggerates. With his hatred of even martyred Jesuits,¹ he cannot reasonably find them predecessors who, with miraculous foresight, thus insisted on doing evil that good might come.

But Mr. Lea's whole position as against the Church is so strange and, at first sight, contradictory, that it is worth while examining whether it is not aimed against the divinity of the Christian religion itself. When giving a rapid glance at the attitude of the Church from the beginning toward persecution, he finds that, "in simplicity of teaching," St. James, representing "the Ebionitic section of the Church, agreed with the Pauline branch!" This at once discloses a system that does away with all inspiration of the New Testament, even as held by the most advanced Protestants. But Mr. Lea finds in the New Testament itself "the seed scattered which was to bear so abounding a harvest of wrong and misery. St. Paul will listen to no deviation from the strictness of his teachings—'But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed' (Galat., i. 8); and he boasts of delivering unto Satan Hymenaeus and Alexander, 'that they may learn not to blaspheme' (1 Tim., i. 20). How this spirit increased as time wore on, may be seen in the apocalyptic threats with which the backsliders and heretics of the seven churches are assailed (Rev., ii., iii.)."

It is some consolation to find that Mr. Lea essentially identifies the Church of the Middle Ages with that of St. Paul and St. John, though he leaves us uncertain concerning St. James and "the Ebionitic section." We can henceforth hear with equanimity that "the process went on with accelerating rapidity;"—"Tertullian shrieks" to Quintilla;—"the Donatist heresy with its deplorable results arose on the question of the eligibility of an individual bishop;"—"when Eutyches, in his zeal against the doctrines of Nestorius, was led to confuse in some degree the double nature of Christ, thinking that he was only defending the dogmas of his friend, St. Cyril, he suddenly found himself convicted of a heresy as damnable as Nestorianism;" "he was not able to grasp the subtle distinction between *substantia* and *subsistentia*, a fatal failing, which proved the ruin of thousands;" and, finally, "those who held commanding positions in the Church and could enforce their opinions, were necessarily orthodox; those who were weaker became heterodox, and the distinction between the faithful and the heretic became year by year more marked."

After all this it is no wonder that Mr. Lea gives us many "a curious commentary on theological perversity," or what he considers "the heated wranglings over questions scarce appreciable by

¹ ii., 567.

the average human intellect.”¹ To the student this will be enough to show the true quality of these volumes whose bulk is worthy of a different learning. Even the general reader, who can pretend to no special knowledge of the case, will question the flippant tone with which Mr. Lea decides questions that have occupied men of learning for so many centuries. Where has he taken his degree in theology? Even has he read through the child’s catechism? He professes to state different doctrines on indulgences, as taught in the Middle Ages and in our own day, not missing a sneer at the “modern commercial spirit” which he discerns in the latter.² But he has understood neither the one nor the other; indeed, they are essentially the same. He is writing of a tribunal whose prime function was the judicial absolution of the innocent or the condemnation of the guilty; yet he has never learned the distinction, known to every Catholic, between absolution from sin, which concerns the conscience alone, and absolution from some charge brought before an exterior court. Of course he knows nothing of absolution from irregularities or censures.³ His mistakes, in consequence, are not less ridiculous than though he maintained that the United States Senate, in refusing to impeach the late President Andrew Johnson, thereby imparted to him absolution and forgiveness of sins. He knows no ecclesiastical immunity that is not impunity for clerical offenders, and he shamefully misunderstands the exemptions of the religious orders.⁴ He is no longer ridiculous, but blasphemous, when he discovers in the commonest Christian relations between man and his Maker what he calls “the current orthodox practices of purchasing, by prayer or money, or other good works, whatever blessings they desired, and expecting nothing without such payment.”⁵

By this time our readers have undoubtedly had enough of Mr. Lea’s theology, whatever they may expect from his history. But we must try their patience a little longer. It is presumed Mr. Lea is fully aware that there are still many Roman Catholics in the world. Although his knowledge of their past controversies is quite unlike that of all other writers, yet he must also be aware that in their ranks have never been wanting men whose intelligence and sincerity common modesty should teach him to consider equal to his own. This is the least we can demand. He may object to our belief in an infallible Church, but by what right

¹ i., 209, 210, 211.

² i., 41, 43. Alexander of Hales (A.D. 1200) has no other definition than our own.

³ See especially i., 343, 398, 437, iii., 275; but the whole work is built on like ignorance.

⁴ i., 304; a lascivious instance, as usual, and a brutal piece of ignorance.

⁵ i., 105.

does he foist on us as infallible his own ignorant, flippant, contemptuous imputations of every evil of mind and will? The instances of the "sacerdotalism" which, according to him, "formed the distinguishing feature of mediæval religion," are exemplified every day round about him. What was true then must be true now. We venture to hope that there are few, even among the most violent enemies of the Church, who would say with Mr. Lea, "the believer did not deal directly with his Creator—scarce even with the Virgin or hosts of intercessory saints. The supernatural powers claimed for the priest interposed him as the mediator between God and man; his bestowal or withholding of the sacraments decided the fate of immortal souls; his performance of the mass diminished or shortened the pains of purgatory; his decision in the confessional determined the very nature of sin itself. The implements which he wielded—the Eucharist, the relics, the holy water, the chrism, the exorcism, the prayer—became in some sort fetiches which had a power of their own entirely irrespective of the moral or spiritual condition of him who employed them or of him for whom they were employed."¹

We have now trespassed enough on the patience of our readers by these ridiculous and absurdly false blasphemies. We will only say once again that their falsehood might have been read in the pages of mediæval writers, cited by Mr. Lea when it suits his own purpose.² He is fond of repeating that the devotion of that age required no interior or "subjective act" on the part of the Christian. Innocent the Third—the great Pope for whom Mr. Lea professes respect while he does all that he can to blacken his reputation—comes back again and again in sermons, many of which were preached to the common people, on the idea of sorrow as necessary to the forgiveness of sins; so much so that the old-fashioned Protestant dogmatists, without Mr. Lea's extreme mastery over citations, might attempt to prove from them that the Pope of that age did not consider confession and priestly absolution necessary at all. We doubt not many have done so.

On more than one occasion Mr. Lea cites the sermons of Egbert of Schönau against the Pifres and other Catharan heretics of Germany in the twelfth century. This strenuous combatant of the faith was at first a cleric of the church of Bonn, and finally became a good and holy Benedictine monk in the monastery from which he takes his name. He is far more famous from certain writings which deal with "subjective" holiness than from his sermons.

¹ i., 47; on page 100 "orthodox asceticism trenches closely on Manichæism," with St. Francis, Tauler, and the Sulpitian Olier as examples!

² Once for all, Mr. Lea is totally unacquainted, to all appearances, with the commonest Catholic practices of the present day, and when he runs across them ages ago he accurately realizes Cardinal Newman's delicious Scripture-reader at "Benediction."

They are the contemplations and visions of his beloved sister Elizabeth, who was a nun in a neighboring convent, and whose influence seems to have drawn him to the monastic calling. Mr. Lea knows in the religious literature of the Middle Ages only that which suits his own theological purposes. Yet he can hardly have failed to come across her name, since he cites that of her friend and correspondent St. Hildegarde.

A short passage from a multitude of others which this simple sister—*incerudita*, says her brother—dictated through obedience, will show whether interior and “subjective” acts of religion were unknown in that age, and whether Christian souls had no acquaintance with God, but only with the priests. These contemplations often take the character of revelations belonging to the extraordinary office of seer or prophet, which St. Paul says is *not to unbelievers, but to believers*,¹ and has always been claimed at irregular intervals in the Church of God. They regularly follow the order of the feasts of the Church’s year and show close knowledge and much pious meditation of the least particulars of the Gospel history. Of herself she speaks as follows: “I prayed our Lord with my whole heart saying: O Lord my God, behold I commend my soul and my body to Thy powerful hand, to Thee, holy and undivided Trinity; to Thee, O Lord, I commit all my troubles, for my spirit is greatly tried in those things which Thou hast wrought with me, because I know that I am altogether unworthy of so great grace. Thou knowest, my Lord, that never have I presumed to ask such things from Thee; but now, since of Thy free goodness Thou hast so magnified Thy mercy with me, I beseech Thee also to keep me so that by no sin I may fall from Thy grace.” This, however deluded we might consider the praying soul to be, is surely not the prayer of one who knows no God except the priest, nor any “subjective” act of religion. And that these high sentiments were not limited to convent walls is plain from the fact that her brother and many others came to draw from her teachings what they might say to the people. It is recorded that great good came from their preaching. This was one of her chief lessons: “Love not the world and those things which are in the world, but do penance for evil deeds because the time is near.” And again: “I warn you that you should love each other. You ought to think how God first loved you, not sparing His only begotten Son, but delivering Him up for you in sacrifice.”² Perhaps her still more practical reprobation of the vices of her day would have found entrance to Mr. Lea’s pages, had she not declared that God assured her the “life of the Catharans was abominable before Him.”

¹ I. Cor., xiv., 22.

² Acta SS. (Bolland.), 18 Jun.; also the recent critical study of Roth (Würzburg, 2d ed., 1886).

II.

In the preceding examination of Mr. Lea's impartiality as an historian, we have also applied our first three tests to his competency for dealing with the period in question. In matters of Church history we have shown—satisfactorily, we think—his lack of necessary training in theology and his strange ignorance of the piety of the age; and, not only is there not an entire absence of prejudice in him, but rather he is beset with the most narrow partisan ideas. He is a decided victim to what may properly be called the Chinese habit of mind—if we may trust the tales of travellers concerning Chinese public opinion of all that is foreign to their own immediate surroundings. Mr. Lea signs his preface from Philadelphia. With that curious rivalry which marks neighboring American cities, New Yorkers forever maintain that great city to be only “a large collection of small villages.” Surely Mr. Lea’s conception of the Roman Catholic Church in general, and of the Middle Ages in particular, dates as far back as the Quaker village of Penn.

Yet all that has gone before is not a tithe of what still remains. It would require a controversy covering the entire scope of universal theology to disentangle the propositions which Mr. Lea so rashly throws out at the beginning and end of his chapters. But all Church history should be written down for him if he would correct his historical positions. His method of dealing with history is as peculiar as his theology. Properly, he does not write history at all. Under the heads of the brief which he holds against the Church, he accumulates any number of examples as striking as may be, and often taken from widely different times and places. This is especially the case in his introductory chapter on the Church, though it is true that his plan nowhere admits of a strictly chronological order. The Inquisition was a judicial organization—a means for the carrying out of certain laws. Naturally, its practical work greatly varied in different times and places, and it is necessary to write separately of its workings in each region where it existed. But it is doubtful whether the Inquisition, thus limited, is a subject of history at all. The mere enforcement of one among many laws gives no adequate presentment of any people or any time.

To understand what the workings of the Inquisition really meant to the populations among whom it was established, would require a knowledge of their general state at the time it began, and of their whole social, economical, political and religious condition during the period it was flourishing among them. A history of the Inquisition otherwise conceived must result in much the same as would a history of the death penalty in the United

States, conceived in the following manner: First, give the statistics of murders, horse-stealings and other capital crimes of a pioneer community, without any reference to what the law-abiding citizens are doing in the meantime. When the imagination is sufficiently aroused by these details, unrelieved by all that accompanied and overshadowed them in the reality, narrate carefully, region by region, all the deaths inflicted in any way on account of crime, or suspicion, or pretence, even, of crime; not only the executions ordered in the regular course of justice, but the doings of the rude, improvised tribunals of lynch law at the South, of the early Californian vigilantes, of vengeful reprisals along the Rio Grande, of the Kentucky *vendettas*, adding in by way of condiment whatever riots or duels of illustrious detail may have happened during the century. Evidently the result would be sufficiently lurid, if brought out by some bonze or mandarin, to perpetuate what we have called the Chinese habit of mind concerning foreigners for many generations. It would not be unlike the book with which Mr. Lea has regaled the American world.

In fact, Mr. Lea's mind and method are both beset with two capital sins for the historian. The first we have already seen. It is that prolific cause of error called by the scholastic philosophers the hunger and thirst after assertions—*appetitus enuntiabilis*—with or without knowledge of the subject concerning which the assertions are made. The second is a preposterous love of anecdote, especially of the unutterable sort. This, as one of Mr. Lea's often quoted authorities might have told him, is destructive of all truth of history.¹ With these two vices, it is evident that not "fifteen years," nor fifteen centuries even, will collect the material necessary for historic truth. All the material collected will be misapprehended, ill-digested, unconsciously falsified by the first vice; and whatever is of real value as a guide through the facts of history will be lost sight of while the second appetite is cramming its maw with the mass of ill-verified, one-sided and fallacious anecdotes with which the contemporary materials of history are sure to abound.

We may take another example from our own day without, we think, any injustice to Mr. Lea's peculiar methods. The history of the death penalty, of which we have spoken, would certainly give a strange idea of American civilization and law. But how would this impression be deepened and rooted in the imagination, were it to be supported by a multitude of details gathered up in police gazettes, in stories of the bandits of the Mississippi or in popular tales of Western adventure, seasoned with the most striking incidents of the Mormon massacres and the doings of the guerillas of the late war! It is true that Mr. Lea, along with the garbage he thus

¹ Potthast, on Matthew of Paris,

gathers from the whole course of the Middle Ages—and his industry as an historical scavenger we have no wish to deny—mixes for the sake of dignity many a reference to the great councils, to the decrees of the canon law and to the acts of the Holy See. But this only renders the final result yet more incongruous to the disgusted student, while it reaches all the more surely to what is perhaps the real end intended, to impress luridly and lastingly the imagination of the ordinary reader.

Such writing of history, we submit, is a crime against humanity. The men of the Middle Ages have passed away, whether to the heaven or hell which they themselves expected, and which seems so amusing to Mr. Lea, or to some infinite azure of nothingness and evolution which his pages give more than one reason to think he would prefer. Still they were fellow-men to us all, and in the name of humanity false witness is not to be borne against them any more than, let us say, against their brethren, the Roman Catholics of Mr. Lea's own day.

Mr. Lea—it is not too much to say—nowhere considers them as they were in reality. He is incapable of understanding their faith; yet faith he himself says was "a determining factor of conduct of the time."¹ With the higher life of the age he is equally unacquainted or, what is worse, equally ignorant of its true meaning. He does not profess to have made himself acquainted with the economic life of those ages, though his main thesis is that "the Church coerces the secular power to burn heretics,"² who according to him are from the mass of the people—from among the poor and the oppressed as against the rich and powerful in league with the priests. He has given us no exposition of his ideas of the social life of the times; he seems never to have analyzed society into its elements. Obvious truths cannot, of course, escape him. He must needs recognize, here and there, that the age was cruel, that war was its natural condition, that the Church's labors were in the long run productive of good, that—"it was fortunate for civilization that Innocent the Third possessed the qualifications which enabled him to guide the shattered bark of St. Peter through the tempests and among the rocks—if not always wisely, yet with a resolute spirit, an unswerving purpose, and an unfailing trust that accomplished his mission in the end."³

Such gifts from Mr. Lea are as much to be suspected as was the Trojan horse coming from the Greeks. He nowhere follows out the course of civilization; in his own field he does not explain the widely different aspects of crusades, of settled trials, of sorcery. He nowhere relates the heavy burdens weighing upon Innocent

¹ Vol. i., 1.

² Index of i., c. xiv. *The Stake.*

³ Vol. i., 128.

the Third quite apart from the destruction of heretics of which, says Mr. Lea, "he never lost sight to the end, amid his endless conflicts with emperors and princes." Even his own pages repeatedly contradict his own assertions. If the Church was mistress of Christendom in alliance with the powerful of the world against the weak, how came these endless conflicts with emperors and princes? If the Church consisted only of Pope and priests, all combined to shear the lambs they were supposed to tend, how came it to pass that the lambs were so eager in following after the shepherds, and that "persecution was unanimously regarded by Europe as necessary and righteous, in spite of the vices and corruption of the ecclesiastical bodies?" Perhaps it is this inextricable confusion of ideas which Mr. Lea wishes to explain by saying that "human impulses and motives are too complex to be analyzed by a single solvent, even in the case of an individual, while here we have to deal with the whole Church in its broadest acceptation, embracing the laity as well as the clergy."¹

Yet, after all that has been said, this book, substantially false in its theological assertions, only accidentally true in its patronizing admissions, everywhere lacking in a systematic exposition of the time which might be as a thread guiding us through all these ages,—at last merits a condemnation severer still, for the unconscionable anecdotes with which it has been loaded down. A tendency to laugh away purity and reverence from the minds of his readers was long since noted in Gibbon. Mr. Lea has surpassed him in the coarse, hard flippancy with which he relates the most scurrilous and salacious anecdotes, wherever there is question of the ministers of religion. Wherever a repressive law has been made against the more disgraceful crimes of mankind—and the clergy are but men, Judas being one of a chosen twelve—he gives it a prominence beyond its real significance when, indeed, he does not altogether mistake its meaning.

Our fourth test is thus applied and answered. This would-be historian presents neither the "physics and politics" nor even the religion of the Middle Ages; that is, he has missed the elements

¹ Vol. i, 208, 224.

² It is well to say a word here of one of Mr. Lea's former attempts at history—the very dirty treatise on *Sacerdotal Celibacy*. It is quoted as authority by such enemies of the Church as the Protestant Bishop A. Cleveland Coxe (in his recent *Baldwin Lectures*). In it Mr. Lea cites even late decrees, which we should naturally suppose were understood by their authors and, at least, by some few living theologians. But no! Mr. Lea, who can officially interpret the Catholic hierarchy of past ages, is quite capable of school-mastering the Rome of the present. To speak seriously, he has, throughout his work,—

1st. Regularly misunderstood the occasion of publishing such decrees;

2d. He has nowhere understood their practical meaning, application, or result.

of the problem he sets himself to solve. His pretended competence from his researches into the jurisprudence of the age will not stand a better examination. Canon law is largely built up from theological elements, and Mr. Lea has not understood the meaning of the theological terms he uses. What idea, then, could he form of the real meaning of the laws in question? In the face of canons and canonists he declares the crime the Inquisition "sought to suppress was a purely mental one," and that "faith was not to be kept with heretics."¹ He has no idea of a united Christendom. What, then, can he know of a jurisprudence whose aim it was to preserve this union intact? He declares that the jurisprudence of a given period presents without disguise its aspirations. And he has not made himself acquainted with the aspirations of an age rooted in Catholic piety! Mr. John Morley notes that there would be some right moral point for viewing international transactions "if independent communities actually formed one stable and settled family."² Such a view of them was certainly acted on by the founder of the Inquisition; but Mr. Lea "declines to view their morality at all." Perhaps he is too much taken up with the immorality of the individual transactions, from which he draws trivial anecdotes to adorn his pages.

Our fifth test was to examine the pretensions of this new work to historical research. Wealth and the leisure of fifteen years, which its announcement allows us to suppose in the author, must necessarily have some result. So far, however, Mr. Lea's boasted access to historic material has not given the student of history the chief satisfaction he has a right to expect. He has neither indexed nor clearly indicated it for us in his confused references, where Popes and Councils too often find strange bedfellows in wandering minstrels and chroniclers of scandal to help the student seriously in his own researches. After a careful examination we are even in doubt how far much of this material is taken at first hand. If we are wrong, then Mr. Lea has often been in the near neighborhood of much real truth, as well as of much falsehood valuable for his own purpose, without recognizing it. This may, perhaps, arise from his utter incompetence to deal with the sources—the technical *Fontes*—of the canon law. We cannot, of course, accuse him of wilfully neglecting the literature of the popular piety of the age; we are obliged to conclude that his ignorance of the Catholic faith led him away from it. But along the lines where he should be best fitted to gather we find strange omissions that lead us to suspect

¹ Vol. i., 228, 400; ii., 468.

² Critical Miscellanies, i., Carlyle.

the fulness of his material, even within the narrow bounds he has set himself.¹

Mr. Lea's method of writing history properly demands nothing more nor less than the whole existing material of the age of which he writes. It is a dangerous method to follow. Without this completeness of material every judgment of the writer must be subjected to doubt; for merely to illustrate conclusions classified ready to hand is very different from proving them. A similar method has been followed, satisfactorily in the main, by Janssen, the great Catholic historian of the "Reformation," and by Taine, the infidel historian of the French Revolution. But in both cases the materials they have gathered may be considered complete; this is their chief defence against the attacks on their conclusions. We have seen that Mr. Lea's material, on account of his prejudice and his ignorance, could not be complete with regard to contemporary documents.

As to modern workers in the same field there is one class whom he so persistently neglects that we cannot acquit him of design. A brilliant succession of Catholic students—especially in Germany, the land of erudition for the Catholic as well as for the Protestant and infidel—has devoted much time and critical attention to the history of the Middle Ages. Their works have met with general acceptance and respect, even among the enemies of their faith; and they have written as men trained in that theology and canon law which Mr. Lea judges so frequently, and so very frequently does not understand. That he has seen the works of one or more of them is shown by a chance citation—and most unworthy it is—from Hefele's gigantic History of the Councils.² On the most important points Mr. Lea has apparently not dreamed of consulting it; he prefers sneering at De Maistre's popular letters, and holding out Rodrigo as "the latest Catholic historian of the Inquisition!"³ The works of Cardinal Hergenroether on this period were published long since. Mr. Lea must know him as the Prefect of the Vatican Archives and the editor of some of the most important *Regesta* of the Popes, but he has not found it worth his while to notice him. Yet there exists an English translation of a small two-volume work of this author, which, almost literally, contains an answer to every attack made on the fair fame of the Church in Mr. Lea's three bulky tomes. As our own purpose has been not to answer the history, but to

¹ V. g. the Bollandist De Smedt's researches in the early history of the mediæval Manichæans.

² II., 363, note, on the safe-conduct of John Huss, treated with Mr. Lea's wonted contempt for Popes' and Councils' explanation of their own actions; also, III., 319.

³ I., 540; also I., 300, note on the Abbé Douais, whose brilliant researches he uses, without attending to his conclusions.

review the historian from his own pages, we are glad to be able to refer to it all those who seek a competent dealing with the burning questions so imprudently stirred up by Mr. Lea.¹

We have but one more question to ask of him. He quotes many saints and great men, of whom he himself says that they were upright and "types, in their several ways, of which humanity in any age might well be proud."² They were on the spot, and might reasonably judge for themselves. Why are they all against him, so remote in age and mind?

It is true, he quotes them promiscuously, after his method of anecdote-telling, which can never prove anything, but at most illustrates. In a single page, to establish one of his points, he brings forward men as widely separated in time and place as would be in politics Oliver Cromwell, George Washington, and Giuseppe Garibaldi. One would hardly think the mere juxtaposition of these names could prove anything by itself as to the advancement or the decline of political freedom. But besides dealing thus strangely with the better class of his witnesses, Mr. Lea too often misunderstands the bearing of their testimony. Their denunciations of the world, the flesh, and the devil scandalize him. Has he never heard that far-seeing men at the present day look askance, or even break forth in terrible denunciation, at nineteenth-century evils? And would he have the history of our age decided solely on such testimony? The morality of American women, for example, by the book called "*Satan in Society*"? Even the tolerant Mr. Bagehot says that the Malthusian remedies against the supposed over-increase of population in civilized countries cannot well be discussed—*virginibus puerisque*. From Mr. Lea's anecdotes, we judge this canon would hardly deter him; but even he should be able to imagine what St. Bernard would have said of the political economists of our day.

Now that our tests have been sufficiently applied to Mr. Lea's work, we may give a distinct answer to the questions presented to us from the start concerning his true worth as a teacher of history. It has not been our purpose to review, much less to disentangle and place in their true light and order, the thousands of assertions and instances which he has thrown together in these bulky volumes.

First, then, Mr. Lea cannot have sought the truth himself—impartially—for he has gone forth to his work in all the narrowness of a sectarian and colonial village, industriously noting down whatever is unusual or repellent to his own mental habits, whatever is grotesque, and—we must say—whatever is lascivious. He is so offensive a partisan that he resembles nothing so much as a

¹ "*Catholic Church and Christian State.*" London, Burns & Oates, 1876.

² I., 234.

party pamphleteer. This has made it possible for him to introduce into what he calls *A History of the Inquisition* direct attacks on the faith of the Church, a defence of John Huss, with tracts on witch craft, on intellect and faith, on the beatific vision, and the Immaculate Conception. The suppression of the Templars is lugged forward at great length, and the religious orders, in their ideal and their practice, are flouted systematically. Whatever such a work may be, it is certainly in no real sense history; nor is it much concerned with the truth about the celebrated tribunals of the Inquisition. Very evidently the design of the author from the beginning has been to make a running attack all along the Church's history in the Middle Ages, not forgetting the apostolic times and our own day. He declares it to have been "the teaching of the Church that a man might lead a life of unimaginable crime and at any moment purchase his salvation." Of the practical piety of St. Augustine and his age he can only say that it was a "triumphant theurgy setting to work with remorseless vigor to extirpate its fallen rival," namely, the pagan gods. To Mr. Lea it "might appear a truism to say that belief is independent of volition;" to Jesus Christ voluntary belief appeared a condition of salvation.¹ In sum, it is hard to say whether Mr. Lea's work is not directed against the Christian religion itself.²

Secondly, Mr. Lea has undoubtedly had many sources for historical investigation ready to his hand. He notably makes use of what has been gathered together by such bitter enemies of the Church as the two Moliniers in France, Tocco and Villari in Italy, and other shining lights of what has been styled the Masonic and anti-Christian school.³ Why he has so utterly neglected all the sources which might have given him an insight into the spiritual and higher life of the ages he so ill-treats we have no means of explaining. We think we can understand his impatience of the ordinary Catholic defences of those times; but what can be said of his policy of silence toward the conclusions of more scientific Catholic students?

As to his method of writing, Mr. Lea certainly throws no small quantity of dust from all imaginable authorities into our eyes; but where, in the midst of his arbitrary and one-sided assertions and wilfully chosen instances, can the reader find the means of checking off the judgments proposed to his acceptance? From Mr. Lea's volumes alone he could scarcely know that such judgments had ever validly been called in doubt. In saying this we do not accuse Mr. Lea of being controversial in manner; he is simply and everywhere assertive. He may be sure that serious historical

¹ St. Mark, xvi., 16.

² Vol. iii., pp. 477, 395, 573.

³ For A. Molinier, see former article, October, 1887, page 702, following Douais.

students of every kind will take his assertions for what they are worth.

Finally, Mr. Lea has proved one thing beyond all dispute: he is incompetent to deal with the material he has gathered. This material is largely theological, and he is innocent of theology. It is bound up with the applications of the canon law, and his boasted jurisprudence does not reach so far as to understand the elementary terms used by the canonists. His subject properly exemplifies the social movement of the entire civilized world during many ages, and apparently Mr. Lea's only knowledge of the course of civilization consists in certain lofty general formulas, borrowed for the most part, concerning the evolution of humanity. Of any analysis of the many elements, religious, political, social and physical, which concur in the development of the human race, of any effort to follow out their activity and assign to each its own special part in the total result, Mr. Lea is quite guiltless. History is to him an immense pudding, where all must be taken in the lump with the exception of the unsavory anecdotes which he pulls out in triumph like so many plums. Even a pudding has an order of top and bottom and sides. The order of heaping together historical material round the commonplaces of the subject is somewhat similar—undigested and indigestible. It is the order in which Mr. Lea places before the student this most disappointing and most exasperating of recent attempts at history. "Quarrels over Burials," "Sexual Disorders," "Clerical Immunity," "The Monastic Orders;" "Simony," "Demoralization of the Church," "Morals of the Laity," "Materials for the Improvement of Humanity;"—are two specimen groups of titles taken at random from the first and last chapters of the entire work. True, all this can easily be made blazing with scandal, and then—such plums of nasty detail! But is such competency the result of any trustworthy historical science?

Last of all, our tests have come to naught if they do not forcibly remind the reader that not only speculative history is sinned against in these three volumes, and the men of a past age grievously misrepresented, but, practically, a serious injustice is thus done to a large body of his fellow-citizens. Mr. Lea has done all that in him lies to revive and to perpetuate the Inquisition mythology. His volumes will not live except as they support partisan attacks on the great Roman Catholic Church. Non-Catholics will judge whether this is in the interests of truth. We Catholics may feel some natural distress at the renewed odium thus cast upon us; but by this time we are used to this kind of religious persecution. We are not ashamed of our brethren of the Middle Ages, whenever they were faithful to our Holy Mother the Church. She was infallible then as now. It is our own beloved Pius IX. who canonized St. Peter Arbues, the third of their martyred Inquisitors.

ART AND RELIGION.

Annual Lecture of Sir Frederick Leighton, President of the Royal Academy. London.

The Decline of Art. By Francis Turner Palgrave, Professor of Poetry at Oxford.

THE literature of the fine arts is written and being written in several languages and many books. In recent years no theme has been more popular or prolific. Numerous quarto, royal octavo and octavo volumes (generally illustrated) on the subject may be found in all the large libraries, and every year adds to the number. The higher class of periodicals give it as much space as they give serious social and political questions. Indeed the fine arts have periodicals of their own, almost always enriched with engravings of every kind which are veritable *livraisons de luxe*, exquisite productions of the arts of the engraver and printer. The biographical branch of the subject is also cultivated with assiduity. If the movement goes on, and there are no signs of its slackening, the "lives of the painters" will soon outnumber the "lives of the poets," and both together the "lives of the saints"; for though art is dying (so we are told and we fear truly told), artists and poets are multiplying. Their name to-day is legion, and to-morrow, or at least in the proximate future, will be legions on legions, while the saints are fewer and fewer in each generation.

All this would imply that the fine arts occupy an important place in modern thought and enlist in their service a large share of the activities of civilized man. Such indeed is the case. Art schools, academies of art, picture galleries, art museums, etc., exist in the principal cities of Europe and America. With us these institutions are of recent origin and, of course, much inferior to those in the European capitals; but they are rapidly increasing in numbers and especially in the quantity and quality of their contents. There are also annual exhibitions of the new works of the studios, while extraordinary occasions are signalized by extraordinary displays. An exhibition or exposition of arts and manufactures is the chief means now employed to celebrate the anniversary of a great event in the history of a nation. The Philadelphia exposition was the chief feature of our centennial *fête* of the Declaration of Independence. Republican France intends in the same way to celebrate next year the hundredth anniversary of the sack of the Bastile, though a black fast in sackcloth and ashes would be a more appro-

priate commemoration. We need not argue that the great attraction of these immense shows are the picture galleries, and consequently that the managers and artists make every effort to give them all the splendor and *éclat* possible. The desire to behold works of art—a desire which has been much stimulated by the exhibitions—is well-nigh universal, and the desire to possess them a passion with the wealthy and refined. The production of them, of paintings especially, has naturally assumed enormous proportions. If quantity could compensate for lack of quality, we should hear no lamentations over the decadence of art. There are probably a hundred thousand pictures turned off the easel every year in Europe and America. These productions are not perishable in the sense that furniture, machinery and even houses are perishable, and therefore are increasing beyond computation. Not a few of them sell for high prices and some of them for very large sums—tens and tens of thousands. Modern French pictures have sold at auction in New York for forty, fifty, sixty and seventy thousand dollars. Ownership of those costly canvases is the badge of the millionaire. In these days, Art for the most part ministers to luxury, fashion and sensuality, and her guerdon is gold. She has forgotten her native language and the glory of her youth, and serves gladly in the temples of Mammon and the Cyprian Venus; but though her hand has not lost its cunning, her soul has lost its inspiration. This brings up the question we propose to discuss: Is there a vital and necessary relation between religion and art?

As both are as old as historic time, and as relics of both are found in many countries and of many epochs, the data for answering the question are not wanting. Indeed most of those relics or remains, those shattered but message-laden monuments of antiquity, seem to show that the two sprang up together in unity and indivisibility, and long remained inseparable. Prehistoric and historic ruins from China to Peru, and from Egypt to Thibet, are temple ruins or mausoleums. The mausoleum was also a temple and the temple a mausoleum. The buildings erected in honor of the gods, and consecrated to their worship, are the only memorials left of many vanished empires, forgotten dynasties and dead though not forgotten theocracies—the only works of man in far distant ages which time has not been able utterly to destroy, as if the tutelary deities, when they abandoned them, cast upon them as a parting gift the last ray of their own immortality.

The genesis of art is found in man's consciousness of the supernatural, and the irresistible impulse of his spiritual nature to give it objective reality, that is, to give it external form and expression.

We are told of the reindeer etching of the prehistoric man on a bone, and of Giotto, when a shepherd boy, drawing sheep on a rock; but all antiquity testifies that the temple or the tomb (the latter was always a shrine and the former almost always a mausoleum) was the first architectural creation and the birth-place of sculpture and painting. Nor is the evidence less strong in favor of poetry and music being primitive and spontaneous expressions of religious feeling and adoration. The æsthetic principle is twin-rooted with the sense of the supernatural—that profoundest as well as loftiest sentiment of the soul. In the sphere of the supernatural the arts have reached their highest perfection. In their strivings to express the supernatural they have created that beauty in divers forms which is the most precious and delightful of the works of man, and is worshipped even by those who scoff at the spiritual ideas of which it is the glorious rhythmic utterance in the audible, or the bright consummate flower of expression in the visible world. The beauty of holiness preceded and produced the holiness of beauty. Of old, and for ages, art was the Iris-winged messenger between the visible and invisible world—the chosen interpreter of the oracles and ordinances of Heaven, and the bearer in return of prayer and the odor of sacrifice. Hence in the ancient world all great art was religious art, pure and simple, or heroic art, which was a blending of the natural and supernatural—the human and divine. In the beginning the sky-born Muses sang of Zeus the Supreme, and next of the inferior deities. Later they swept the chords of the heroic harp and breathed through the shepherd's reed. They told of gods, demigods, heroes and fair women whose bright eyes set fire to walled cities; of the joys and vicissitudes of battle, the glory of victory, the dark decrees of the inexorable fates; of the blessings as well as the tragedies of life, the tender as well as the warlike virtues, and lastly of the golden age and sylvan pomp of Arcadia, and the calm pleasures of the pastoral life. The poet, being of their kindred and in communion with them, was able to see and hear them one summer night as the "glorified train," led by Apollo, streamed over Thessalian hills and vales, on their way to Olympus their "endless abode":

"Whose praise do they mention?
Of what is it told?
What will be for ever,
What was from of old.

"First hymn the Father
Of all things and then
The rest of immortals,
The actions of men.

"The day in his hotness,
The strife with the palm,
The night in her silence,
The stars in their calm."¹

The celestial sisterhood are heard and seen no more; their voices are hushed, but the goat-footed Pan, who is not dead but very much alive, is still piping with great vigor, and the songs that we hear are the songs of the sirens and the satyrs, who continue to load the air with bacchanalian minstrelsy and erotic madrigals.

The decadence of ART, that is, of the arts in space, or arts of design, to which we shall now confine ourselves, is confessed on all sides with much speculation and eloquent discourse as to the cause or causes of it. Indeed, the investigation of the influences and circumstances which brought the arts to perfection in ancient and mediæval times, and of those adverse influences "rigged with curses dark" which wrought their downfall in both periods, especially those which blighted Italian painting and sculpture, constitute no small part of the volume of art literature. One of the essays cited above, Professor Palgrave's, deals with the whole subject, but only in a cursory way, and several of his generalizations are open to criticism. The other, the last annual lecture of the President of the Royal Academy, Sir Frederick Leighton, confines itself to Italian painting, and his *rationale* of the subject embraces questions which he does not answer, though he asks them, but doubtless which he will answer, or attempt to answer, on a future occasion. In many respects we think he shoots wide of the mark. Meantime we proceed to offer an answer to the main question on these pages because, to the best of our knowledge, no satisfactory elucidation of it is to be found in English art literature, which, for the most part, is vitiated by anti-Catholic prejudice.

We may say at the outset that the authorities all agree that religion has had a great deal to do with the development of the fine arts—a mere truism, by the way—but none of them, as far as we know, give it the paramount place in the category of æsthetic motives, nor dwell in any detail on the purposes which called its creative energies into play, now in one field, now in another, in the wide domain of art. Some tell us that a happy conjunction of circumstances, together with qualities of race, accounts for those marvels of architecture, sculpture and painting which signalized the age of Pericles, and Phidias, and their immediate successors, and made Athens and Olympia the most beautiful cities in the world. Similar reasons are given for a still more wonderful

¹ Matthew Arnold.—*Apollo Musagetes.*

phenomenon—an ampler revelation of the beautiful—Italian painting and Gothic architecture of the prime. These explanations are insufficient and quite superficial. The conditions necessary to the production of great works of art are many. First of all comes the artist himself, of whom we must not only postulate genius, but genius quickened by fervid feeling and exalted by sublime ideals. Of necessity he breathes the spirit of the age, which is the bequest of all the past to the present, and which is as inevitable in its workings as the law of gravitation. If great ideas are in the air, he inhales them and reproduces them, with the element of his own personality added. If that spirit be inimical to high art, that is, to religious and ethic creations, as it undoubtedly is in these days, the light within him burns low and his magistral hand is crippled. Then genius is the gift of nature to the individual, not to the generation or the race, although at certain rare epochs it is lavishly bestowed on groups of contemporaries, while at other times it is not vouchsafed at all. The tide of poetic inspiration ebbs and flows. Other conditions may be mentioned. The traditions of the schools handed down from one master to another, until the professional secrets thus communicated became the property of the whole profession; the severe technical training which the old apprenticeship system enforced and which compelled the apprentice to travel from city to city to perfect himself in his art. To these must be added the peace and prosperity of the land, and the patronage of princes, nobles and ecclesiastics of all ranks, of which the modern equivalent is the indiscriminate but profuse patronage of the public under the law of supply and demand. Most of the treasures of the museums have been taken from churches and monasteries, and these works have lost much of their meaning and power by their removal. Torn from the buildings to which they belonged, and from associations which hallowed their charms, and having no relation with their present surroundings but a numerical one, they suggest, in the vulgar light in which they are now seen, nothing so much as Samson making sport for the Philistines.

We are told that Evolution, including the "Reformation," is the great irresistible cause of the decadence of the fine arts, which movement of decadence has been going on ever since the Parthenon was rebuilt and the Acropolis and Athens restored, after the Persian wars, with the exception of a season of reaction or revival towards the close of the Middle Ages and the beginning of modern history. The Greeks were the chosen race to endow the human family with beauty in art, and the Italians, who were partly of their blood and taught by them, took up the mission at a later day, but carried the torch only for a space before it died out in their hands. The Greeks, directly or indirectly, were all in all! Christian art

was but the after-glow of a sunken sun, and the "Reformation" simply imparted velocity to the downward movement which had begun two thousand years before. We venture to say, contrary to all this, that art was flourishing and advancing when struck with blight by the "Reformation," and that the sole cause of its progressive decline and degradation since is not evolution or dearth of genius or want of technical skill, but PROTESTANTISM.

If all monumental art in Egypt, Greece, Babylon, Nineveh, Phoenicia and the regions sacred to Mohammed, Buddha, Brahina, and Confucius in the east, and to the deities of the Toltecs, Aztecs and Peruvians in the west, was an expression of the supernatural or heroic, all Christian art, with exceptions too slight to notice, down to the "RENAISSANCE," was purely religious. Christian painting and sculpture began in the Catacombs, and this fact is one of great significance. Although it is not questioned, we may as well cite De Rossi, the first of Roman archæologists, as the latest authority for it, with whose name we will couple that of Rio, author of the celebrated work, "De La Poésie Chrétienne." When God, in the person of Jesus Christ, the Son of Man, appeared among men, the commandment forbidding the making of images and human likenesses for religious purposes ceased to have the prohibitive character it possessed under the Old Law. In fact, it was practically repealed, like much else in the Jewish system. Symbolic and emblematic representations of the mysteries and miracles of the New Faith began to appear round her altars, and especially on the walls and ceilings of the cubicula in the Catacombs as soon as the persecuted Christians began to bury their martyrs, hold their prayer meetings and celebrate the eucharistic and other sacramental rites in those subterranean cemeteries and chapels. Nor were the wall-paintings limited to the representation of symbols and signs. The SAVIOUR appears in various guise, sometimes as a shepherd wearing a Phrygian cap and carrying a lamb on his shoulders, sometimes as Orpheus, playing on the lyre and taming savage beasts, sometimes with a rod in his hand restoring Lazarus to life or performing some other miracle. The Blessed Virgin with the Infant Saviour, and Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Saints and Angels are depicted without disguise. The parallelism of the Old and New Testaments—the figure and the thing which it prefigured—the type and ante-type are also delineated. In fact, every path which sacred art pursued in after ages was opened up in the Catacombs, and all the great themes, with the exception of one or two, were treated there long before the first ecclesiastical basilica was decorated with mosaic paintings. The principal exception was the Crucifixion, which was too solemn or awful a subject for the early Christians. The veil of centuries had to be thrown over

that stupendous event before it could be approached from the side of art.

The sculptures found in the Catacombs and other cemeteries, and in the burial vaults in the precincts of St. Paul's and St. Peter's, correspond in subject and treatment to the frescos. The sarcophagi, of which a considerable number have been disinterred, are covered with reliefs, representing, for the most part, scenes and personages in sacred history. The statuary of the Catacombs, of which but little has been recovered, is of the same character. The statues of the Good Shepherd and of St. Hyppolytus in the Lateran museum may be mentioned as the best specimens. These precious sepulchral monuments and remains, as well as the sepulchral inscriptions on the marble fragments of the tombs, and a thousand objects of Christian archaeology, such as terra cotta lamps, glass chalices, etc., are housed in the Lateran and Kircher museums and in the crypt of St. Peter's, where they give ocular proof that the primitive Christians had no antipathy even to "graven images," and that hieratic writing on stone and hieratic art on stone were each the complement of the other.

Thus the relation between Christianity and Art dates from the earliest days of the former. When our HOLY RELIGION emerged from her hidden sanctuaries into the light of day in the time of Constantine, her handmaid, Art, accompanied her and shared her prosperity and proclaimed her triumph in many a noble monument. New altars rose on the crests of the Seven Hills, and on the spots sanctified by the blood of the martyrs. The form of the pagan temple was not suitable for the new system of worship; that of the basilica was, for it afforded accommodation to the public. The temple was constructed for the convenience of the priests, augurs and magistrates; the CHURCH, which opened wide its portals and invited the laity to assist at the sacred ceremonies and participate in the sacrament of the altar, required the broader plan of the hall of justice and market-house. The new basilicas were majestic structures of large dimensions. Their inner walls and arches soon began to glow with pictorial compositions in glass mosaics of the same purport as the catacomb paintings and sculptures. Mosaic painting is the most enduring form of pictorial art, and lasts as long as the walls on which it glistens. Soon the vast interiors exhibited a panorama of sacred history—a luminous unfolding of the successive scenes, events and characters of the wondrous drama of the doom and destiny of the human race from creation down. Without this epic splendor, this radiant symbolism, this imperial robe of many shining colors, the Church were an unfinished and unfurnished house—the Spouse of Christ were without her wedding garment. The craft of the mosaicist was no

new one, but the new religion infused new life into it and elevated it in a literal as well as a moral sense. It was lifted from the floor to wall and arch. Hitherto it had been employed almost exclusively as a decorative pavement for the Roman villas, palaces and baths; but now, cubes of dyed glass of every shade and tint were substituted for the dull tesserae in which the floor designs were executed; and walls and entablature, apse, arch and dome—the whole rotunda of the baptistery, the vast rectangular area of the basilica, were clothed with spacious compositions of grand design, in the new brilliant material.

It soon became apparent that the form of the basilica as a sacred edifice demanded modification. Transepts must be added to realize the figure of the cross and make that type the fundamental one in all church architecture—an idea that has been fully realized. The altar was a new feature, and the most important of all. It was the centre of the system, the heart of the organism, as it were, of which the lofty roof was but the canopy. The church was the House of God in no metaphorical or hyperbolic sense. He dwelt there visibly, though in mystery as in the darkness of excessive light. The altar was His throne and special place of abode. His oracles, in which there was no ambiguity, were delivered from the ambones that rose, the one on the right side, the other on the left. The winged emblems of the four evangelists looked down on the readers of the gospels and epistles,—Oh! you whom He has called and chosen, to whom He has promised everlasting life in the mansions of His Father, whom He feeds from that altar with the “bread of life” which is Himself, build Him a tabernacle like that which Peter proposed to build on Mount Tabor. Array and adorn it, clothe it and crown it with all the magnificence, splendor and beauty your genius, your skill and your earthly riches can compass. From of old you know the appropriate elements to use. Let precious stones and gold and silver and ivory be employed. Let the colors be purple, scarlet, blue and orange. Let chalice, pyx and paten, lamp and candelabrum, crozier and mitre be studded with diamonds, rubies, sapphires and emeralds, and further enriched with figured representations of divine persons and things. Let the sacrificial robes of the priest be of purple and fine linen and gold embroidered tissues from the Orient and flowered silks from the looms of Greece and Sicily and far Cathay. Let stole and cope and chasuble be also sown with gems, and shimmer and shine as he moves in front of that tabernacle celebrating the august mystery of the Mass. Let the TE DEUM and MAGNIFICAT, in Ambrosian chant, accompanied by “flute and soft recorder,” rise through the thick mist of incense to the echoing rafters, filling every soul with gladness. And to crown all, let the majestic

figure of the Saviour, with the golden nimbus round His head and His right hand uplifted in benediction, overshadow priest and altar like a cloud of fire. So it was, "and the House of the Lord was filled with Glory of the Lord."

The churches were thus great repositories of art work, in one sense like our modern museums, but in many respects very different, for every picture, statue or other thing in the former was placed in relationship with every other, so as to give unity to the whole, while each owed much of its significance and impressiveness to its situation and surroundings. Very many of the productions in which the churches abounded were *ex-voto* offerings. No offering was more acceptable to the patron saint than a picture of him or her, subscribed with a prayer for his or her intercession. No memorial of a deceased parent or child, husband or wife, was so much esteemed as a mortuary chapel, or at least a statue or a picture. The CHURCH was the nursery of all kinds of artists, because it was the patron of all kinds of art. Not merely the architect, the sculptor and the painter were in requisition, but the workers in metals and glass, the wood carver, the enameler, the illuminator, the musician and musical instrument maker, and not the last or least, the lace makers, embroiderers and tapestry weavers. The works of the needle and the loom—what may be called the feminine arts—took rank with the works of the goldsmith, the enameler and the mosaicist, and justly retain that rank.

The primary purpose of this infinite art exuberance was not merely to please the eye and ear or attract the crowd, but to glorify God, and next, to honor the Blessed Virgin and saints, instruct the laity, touch all hearts with sentiments of piety and devotion, and especially to strike the souls of sinners with the terrors of Judgment, Purgatory and Hell. But æsthetic considerations were not overlooked. On the contrary, they had great weight, and in many instances were supreme, as the following inscription on an *ex-voto* in St. Clement's would indicate: "That this picture may outshine the rest in beauty, behold the priest, Leo, studied to compass it!" The artist worked as he had been taught in conformity with the æsthetic canon which was of Pagan origin, but the ecclesiastics who ordered the work (the priest himself was often the artist) and under whose superintendence it was carried on, took good care that he also conformed to the sacred canon.¹ With them,

¹ All through the Christian epochs down to the modern times a great many ecclesiastics of all ranks were artists. We quote the following from Rio, "Formes de l'Art—Peinture": "L'alliance des hautes dignités ecclésiastiques avec la prééminence dans le culte des beaux-arts fut encore plus fréquente dans le onzième siècle, époque d'activité redoublée pour les imaginations que l'attente de la fin du monde avoit engourdis. Heldric et Adélard, l'un Abbé de St. Germain d'Auxerre, l'autre Abbé de

probably, beauty *qua* beauty was but the secondary motive. They were intent on higher things, thus pluming ART and preparing her way for higher flights than any she had yet achieved. The artist may, and, it is earnestly hoped, will express the new ideas with all the brilliancy, grace and elevation that he may, but he must in no degree depart from the traditions of the Church, nor reject the ethical standards or physical types that have grown up in her bosom. There was much wholesome restraint and reticence in early Christian art, owing to the contiguity in time and place of idolatry and the irreverence and profanity of the Roman populace and other Pagan communities. The morbid fear of idolatry which gave rise to the Iconoclasts—a sect which in after times inflicted great damage on the CHURCH and irreparable disasters on ART, was not felt in the Apostolic age. But of that hereafter.

The rapid decline of the Rome of the Cæsars involved the decline of Roman art. Paganism as a vital form of worship had virtually died out, and so had the old Roman virtues. An era of military tyranny and violence set in, and worse evils followed. The city and social life, from the highest to the lowest, were inundated by a flood of inexpressible corruption, licentiousness and depravity. The last breath of poetic inspiration had mingled with the air. Technique fell away. This is plainly visible in works still extant. But though technique was failing, the Christian ideals, or rather the types and figures which represented them, continued to grow in number and ethical power. In fact a new style of pictorial art, which gave promise of a vigorous life, appeared at this time. Later, when Rome became the prey of Goth and Vandal; when the Western Empire was overthrown, and ruin marked Italy for its own, nothing remained firmly standing and broadly visible, above the succession of cataclysms, but the Church. It was now the sole sanctuary of art, which fled before the face of the barbarians and took refuge, with what remained of classic culture and literature, in the cloisters. The Popes, always the guardians of arts and letters, were able to save the basilicas and some of the older buildings from the general wreck. Power and virtue went out from their right hand and the outstretched fingers of their right hand, and checked the architects of ruin. To the pontiffs we are indebted for such memorials of ancient and early Christian Rome as have escaped the thousand years of catastrophes from Alaric to the Connétable de Bourbon.

Passing by the revival in Ravenna under the Exarchate and the Arian Goths, with the acknowledgment that the church mosaics

St. Tron, étaient célèbres de leurs temps comme peintres de miniatures, et ses fonctions épiscopales n'empêchaient pas Saint Berword, évêque d' Hildesheim, de peindre lui-même les murs et les plafonds de son église et de former des élèves."

there surpass all others in magnificence, if not in beauty, and outnumber those in Rome itself, we find that the next great epoch in the history of art was ushered in by the edict of the Emperor Leo the Isaurian against the "worship of images." An iconoclastic taint, contracted originally from the synagogue, had long infected the Eastern Church; but it was not until Leo ascended the throne that it became the policy of the State, and took the shape of a formidable persecution. Mohammedanism had rapidly risen to glory and dominion in Arabia, Syria, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Northern Africa and Spain. The ominous shadow of the Prophet fell broadly on Europe, as well as on Asia and Africa, and spreading westward threatened to wrap the Christian world in darkness. The Caliphate was a conquering and seemingly irresistible power, that had subjugated in one brief century various kingdoms, tribes and tongues, and now ruled an empire nearly as extensive and populous as the Roman in its palmy day. The conquest of Europe, with its corollary, the extirpation of Christianity, was the supreme object of Moslem ambition, and this it ostentatiously proclaimed and audaciously attempted. The Moorish power in Spain with its Egyptian and African allies poured its fanatical myriads through the passes of the Pyrenees who, winged "with fiery expedition," never stopped until they watered their horses in the Loire. More than half of France was overrun, and scourged and blasted with fire and sword. His battle-line there, on the plains of Tours, was, however, the high-water mark of the Saracen's power and progress in the west. There he was met by the Franks and their German allies under Charles Martel and driven back with great slaughter. The prestige of invincibility, which hitherto had attached to his banner, and the prestige of Mohammed as *the* Prophet of God, were eclipsed forever in the eyes of the northern nations.

But in the East the Caliph exalted his horn higher than ever. Persia and part of Asia Minor were added to his realm, to be followed later by larger additions in both directions. The wars of Islam were holy wars—a ruthless physical-force propagandism. The destruction of the Infidel, if he refused to be converted, was enjoined by the Koran, and rewarded by the joys of Paradise. Where Mohammed prevailed the churches were despoiled or demolished, or eviscerated of their artistic contents and turned into mosques. The ruins of four thousand religious edifices marked his progress in the Orient. The cross was pulled down and supplanted by his standard, which, "fanned by conquest's crimson wing," waved defiantly in the skies of Asia, Africa and Europe. Bagdad's and Cairo's shrines of fretted gold, but exempt from the hated likeness of living thing, now more than vied with those of Rome and Constantinople.

This terrible propagandism, with its absolute proscription of pictures and statues, profoundly affected opinion among the Greeks. Success is supposed to be the sign of Divine favor, and the worshipers of success belong to every creed and clime. The Moslem triumph gave a new and powerful sanction to the Iconoclasts. The Iconoclastic spirit was abroad; it was the spirit of the age. The fanaticism spread through the Greek world and swayed the untutored mind and dictated the revolutionary policy of the Isaurian. He put all the powers of the State in motion against the clergy and laity who adhered to the ancient practice. His edicts and the bloody enforcement of them vitally affected Byzantine art, and more than art. Then and thus began that conflict which detached Rome and Italy from the empire and developed the schism which ultimately separated the Greek from the Catholic Church. The remote cause of the conflict was doubtless the contrary opinions of the Greek and Latin doctors of the Church on the personal appearance of our Saviour and the Blessed Virgin. The latter maintained that they were the most beautiful of human beings, while the former maintained they were insignificant in figure and ugly in face. St. Augustine was the leading champion of the Roman doctrine on this question, but was re-enforced by St. Ambrose and St. Jerome, and also by St. John Chrysostom and St. Gregory of Nyssa, of the Eastern Church. St. Cyril, following Tertullian, was the chief exponent of the Byzantine theory—a theory which would have proved fatal to Christian Art if it had not been condemned by Pope Adrian I., who pronounced Jesus Christ the new Adam and perfect in face and form. Evidently the Byzantines were out of line in more things than in the doctrine of the Trinity. But our concern is with the consequences of the artistic feud. Steam, we are told, is susceptible of a triple and a quadruple expansion, and is, therefore, capable of exerting power a third and a fourth time. The proscription of images by the Moslems was the chief cause of the ascendancy which the Iconoclasts at last obtained among the Greeks; and this in turn exercised a pernicious influence on Christian art far beyond the confines of the empire. The emperors were still, in the eyes of men, the greatest and grandest of human figures. Constantinople was the capital of the world, and shone with the blended majesty of Rome and Athens, with the lustre of ancient and contemporary renown. When the imperial government anathematized "image worship" and proceeded to destroy the painting and statuary which had illuminated the churches for ages, the blow resounded far and wide, and was felt as a disaster in the work-shops and art-centres of Italy and Gaul. But Gregory II. and his successors were equal to the crisis, and boldly confronting Leo and his successors in the purple, with all their pomp

and prestige, saved the cause of art by maintaining intact the ideas, usages and traditions of the Roman Church. This victory of the Popes over Iconoclasticism and Cæsarism brought about, in the course of time, the greatness of the mediæval Papacy and the mediæval Church, but the immediate influence of the schism on art was a detrimental one. The monumental remains of the period show a rapidly growing degeneracy—a wider and wider departure from the ancient standards. Other causes contributed to this deeper decadence. The tides of barbarian invasion had not ceased to flow. Pagan tribes from beyond the Danube and the Volga and the Scandinavian shores of the Baltic, continued to pour into Europe. The savage Bulgarians and Hungarians, Mongol nations, and the Slavoniāns, an Arian nation, followed in the steps of the German barbarians, and gathered the gleanings, if gleanings there were, of the field which had been long shorn of the golden harvest of Greek and Roman civilization, or swept, as the case might be, with the besom of destruction. The fiercer Northmen, sea and land robbers, worshippers of Thor and Odīn, carried the raven banner through England, Ireland, Scotland, France, and round the shores of the Mediterranean for over two hundred years, proving themselves deadlier enemies of monasteries, churches, and Christianity in general, than the fanatics and nomads of the east. These were what are called the "Dark Ages," but perhaps they were not quite as dark as they are painted. In the depths of the darkness, such as it was, another form of Christian art sprang up and flourished. In the shelter of the cloister, where it was cherished, it attained to rare excellence. This was the adornment of manuscripts with illuminations and miniature paintings. Like mosaic painting, it was no new invention, for it was known to the Egyptians, as the Book of the Dead in the Turin library shows; but it now received a development far beyond what Egyptians, Greeks or Romans had given it. Christianity exalted and refined whatever it touched. The monasteries had kept alive the embers of ancient learning, and preserved the masterpieces of the Greek and Roman poets, philosophers and historians, which were preserved nowhere else except in Constantinople.

But the Holy Scriptures were their chief treasures, and on these and on Missals, Books of Hours, and kindred works, they lavished a wealth of illustration and ornament of such quality that miniature painting rose to an equal rank with other branches of the pictorial art. The whole cycle of Biblical subjects and "Lives of the Saints" was once more reproduced in brilliant and fascinating colors, on the parchment pages of the chief books of the Old and New Testament, the Mass books, prayer books, hymn books, and all kinds of religious works. The classics were adorned in the

same way, with subjects taken from Greek and Roman mythology and the historical legends of both nations. In these classical illustrations may be discerned the dawnings of that mythological revival in art which burst out so luxuriantly in the *cinq^e cento* and the following century. The illuminations, though of small dimensions, far excelled the mosaics in variety and range of expression. The latter were architectonic in design and effect, and the expression of feeling and emotion was beyond their scope and foreign to their nature. On the other hand, the soul of the cloister-artist, who spent much of his time in meditation and prayer, passed into his work. His purity, his asceticism, his mysticism, were reflected in it. All the noble and tender emotions of the heart, hushed in a divine calm, all the spirituality of the higher life, and of an imagination in habitual communion with the skies, found expression in a goodly number of those monastic productions. One may discern in them the first faint rays of that celestial beauty, the meridian splendor of which beams in Fra Angelico's and Raphael's Madonnas. The uncial letters and majusculæ were such marvellous combinations of curves and colors that calligraphy in the hands of the monastic scribes become also a variety of fine art. The crucifixion as an art theme makes its first appearance in an illumination. Irish miniatures show the pointed arch two hundred years before Abbé Suger of Cluny began to build St. Denis'. Apropos of Ireland, it is impossible to speak of miniature painting without dwelling for a moment on the work of the Irish artists in that line, and in decorative penmanship as exhibited in grotesques, arabesques, borders, majusculæ and uncials. The Irish artists and scribes, often the same persons and in addition workers in gold, silver, bronze, glass and copper, held the foremost place in all branches of the illuminating art during the "Dark Ages," and taught it to the Scots, Anglo-Saxons, Franks, Germans, Switzers, Northern Italians, and, in short, all Christian Europe. Many specimens of their illumination work, bright as ever, and displaying a fertility of fancy in the creation of inter-linear combinations and grotesque forms, unrivalled in the whole range of art, and also examples of their unique and inimitable decorated metal work, may be seen in the public collections of Dublin, London, Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Berlin, Vienna and Rome. The Irish monks were the principal missionaries of the time to the heathen, and practised art as well as preached the Gospel. It was then that Ireland won the peerless title of the Isle of Saints and her sanctity flowered in art as well as in missionary enterprise and miracle. The development on the æsthetic side was naturally commensurate with the development on the religious side.¹

¹ MARGARET STOKES: *Early Christian Art in Ireland*. Miss Stokes's book (1887) is an invaluable one on the subject of which it treats.

Before quitting the "Dark Ages" let us bear in mind that they bequeathed inestimable legacies to later times. Let us not forget that they synchronised the birth throes of the modern nations and the modern languages, and that the illustrious names of Charlemagne, Alfred, Brian Boroihme and Duns Scotus Erigena belong to them. Along their sombre paths we pass into higher regions, where, though everything is on a grander scale, we find a strong family resemblance to the scenes we have left behind. We enter now on what may be called the world's heroic age. Every nation has its heroic age either in fact or romance, but the mediæval cycle was the actual heroic age of Christendom at large. The thousand years of prophecy had passed, and summer and winter, seed-time and harvest, still returned in regular order. No portents in the skies announced the speedy consummation of the world. The normal condition was one of peace, not of war. Men sowed and reaped, planted and built, started industries and united themselves in communities. The Caliphs were no longer formidable and the Ottoman Sultans had not yet become formidable. The Saxons, Lombards, Danes, Normans, and other Northern nations, following the example of the Franks and Goths, had embraced Christianity, and established settled governments. Political, social and industrial customs and land tenures had solidified into the feudal system, which coincided with the boundaries of the new Romano-Teutonic States, and which was absolute in those immense areas. That system, in conjunction with Christianity, developed a complex and in many respects a noble civilization. Chivalry appeared accompanied by the Muses, "like another sun risen on mid-noon." Woman was idealized and reverenced partly in honor of her native charms and partly in remembrance of the Virgin Mother of God. Her beauty was celebrated by the harp of the minstrel and the sword and lance of the knight. Tournaments, jousts and "courts of love" were the pastime of kings and queens, lords and ladies. On the serious side the manifestations were infinitely more wonderful. Apparently the heart of man never beat so high. Never was his imagination so creative. There was an outpouring of the divine afflatus unprecedented since the days of the Apostles. Miracles ceased to be wonders; saints and saintly warriors were thick as stars in the sky, and their achievements streamed like meteors in the August night. Poetic inspiration was also at the flood, and poets and trouveres, troubadours and bards of high and low degree, trod the dewy lawns and wandered from bower to hall, singing as they went, and knights-errant, bent on righting wrongs, rode through the land; and, lo! the land itself was Arcadia, and the age after all was not the heroic, but the Golden Age! At least so it seems, for the potent spells of its enchantment descend

from generation to generation, and we see it still through a faery light and the glamour thrown over it by the Wizard of the North.

The period, we may assume, began with the great Hildebrand, Gregory VII., and ended, let us say, with Leo X. What is called the age of the Renaissance—a movement which followed the sun from South to North, and visited one place after another like the spring—finds a place in Italian chronology only, and even there only by figure of speech. The time was really the closing of the mediaeval and the beginning of the modern era, between which, no more than between any other two contiguous eras, can a line of demarcation be drawn. The river of time which flows forever cannot be cut in twain. The Mediæval Age was the age of the Gregory already mentioned, of St. Francis of Assisi; St. Thomas of Aquin, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, St. Catherine and St. Bernardine of Siena, St. Thomas of Canterbury; of Dante, of Cimabue, of Giotto, of the two Pisanos, of Fra Angelico, of Petrarch, the day-star of the Renaissance, of Peter the Hermit, of Innocent III., of St. Dominic, of St. Louis, of the Cid, of the two Alphonsons, of Joan of Arc, of Savonarola, of Chaucer, of Roger Bacon ; it was the age of the great monastic and military orders of knights, of the mendicant orders, of the schoolmen, the age when hospitals, schools and universities were founded in large numbers and richly endowed. It was also, as will appear in the sequel, the age of Perugino, of Raphael, of Bramante, of Michael Angelo, of Francia of Bologna, and of Titian of Venetia. Above all it was the age of the Crusades ! Then, but never before or since, did whole nations, acting as one, pour out their blood and treasure for ideas, or rather for an idea. Then were performed such feats of valor and heroism as are rivalled only in legendary lore. Then, and never before or since, did the States of Europe constitute one great confederation, recognizing in the person of the Sovereign Pontiff the authorized expositor of the higher law and the appointed international arbitrator.

It was also the age when artists and artisans, following the example of the monastic orders, who had done great things, and were in the zenith of their repute, organized themselves into guilds, which became powerful agencies for the advancement of art and civilization, and which were in a measure religious confraternities, having many features of the monastic system. The glory of those free Masonic brotherhoods and Knights of Labor was not the observance of mysterious ceremonial rites which have lost their meaning, or the promotion of selfish class schemes, but the erection, equipment and adornment of those great civil and religious edifices to which pilgrimages will be made while religion or civilization endures. In those days the master-mason was also architect and sculptor, and often painter, representing in his own person the

several arts of which the cathedral was the embodiment; and this unity of artistic power in variety, in the mind and hand of the individual, lasted to the time of the great decadence.

Gothic architecture, with the painting and sculpture kindred to it which accompanied it, was the expression in form of this Dædal epoch. The loftiness of its pointed arches and ribbed ceilings, of its shooting spires, pinnacles, finials, triangular gables and massive towers, typified and were made to typify the exalted religious feeling and heroic temper of the time. The cathedral or minster was a translation into stone of the spirit of the age. The vast translucent windows, emblazoned with lustrous images, commanded vistas of heaven, so to speak. The light that carpeted the intercolumnar spaces of the broad nave with "sky robes woven of Iris's woof," and dimly lighted the shadowy aisles, streamed through the glorified bodies of the saints. The painted glass, with its jewel-sheen, reproduced in brighter colors than ever the time-honored familiar scenes and personages of sacred history, now a larger volume. Nor was the painting confined to glass. Every vacant wall-space (there was but little left) was covered either in fresco or mosaic.¹ Nor was even this enough. The new style called imperatively for plastic art, to articulate its ideas, and emphasize its symbolism. The spirit that laid the solid foundation, and soared in spire and tower, generously responded. The building within and without was peopled with marble figures and faces. The stone everywhere started into life, assuming human shape, or burgeoning into leaf, flower and fruit. Grand visages looked out from the corbels, crockets and capitals. Angels' heads, smiling with the exhaustless *naïveté* of childhood, spread their tiny wings continuously along the cornices and mouldings. The richly carved pulpit rested on the backs of lions. The wood-work of the choir and stalls was also covered with carved panels. The domain of church sculpture and painting was extended into the fields of science. The artists passed from the Bible and the Lives of the Saints, from St. Thomas Aquinas and Dante, into allegory and the personification of the virtues and vices, and thence into profane learning. Astronomy especially furnished them with numerous themes. The whole constituted an encyclopædia writ large in signs and figures, and blazing with richest color, for all the sculpture was brightly tinted after the manner of the Greeks. The exterior also teemed with statues and reliefs, the façade especially, and the portals more especially. There all the might of the

¹ Jules Simon says: "La religion Catholique est la seule qui ait parfaitement compris la nécessité d'avertir les âmes et de les arracher à la matière par des signes matériels. Elle ne laisse pas une place dans ses temples sans les couvrir de tableaux, de statues, d'images, de sentences tirées de l'Ecriture, ou d'ex-votos."

mædieval chisel was seen and still may be seen, where the work has escaped the Iconoclasts of the "Reformation" and subsequent revolutions. Immense compositions of the Resurrection and Last Judgment and other scenes in Revelation overhang the doorways and climb the front. And high up on the eaves, where the prince of the powers of the air has dominion, the weird fancy of the north has found a realm which it has peopled with creatures of its own. There, jutting from the wall, squat the monstrous gargoylest—brutish forms of vampires, ghouls, goblins damned and other low-caste denizens of the nether world. They serve the Church as water-spouts, for devils also must serve, however unwillingly, in carrying out the great plan. One other thing was yet wanting. The finished structure yearned for a voice to translate its sublimity into sound, and utter its aspirations in accents commensurate with the architecture, painting and sculpture. The bell-chimes from the tower, sweet and far-reaching though they might be, were not prayer—only a call to prayer. The organ, for centuries the favorite instrument of the sacred choirs, now enlarged its proportions and multiplied its powers. From its size, columnar front and lofty height, it became one of the architectural features of the interior. Vaulted roof and clustered column, and storied wall, and crypt and tomb below soon resounded, matin and vesper, with divine strains—psalms, litanies and hymns. On *fête* days, which were many, when ten thousand voices intoned the *Gloria* or in penitential seasons the *Dies Iræ*, and the stringed instruments and the organ mingled in the song, which rose as on the wings of the winds through the overarching forest of pillars and curved mouldings to the stone ribs of the roof, the symphony of sweet sound was mightier than the mingled anthem of ocean and tempest in Staffa's pillared cave or where the Atlantic breaks in loudest diapason on the basaltic colonnades and cliffs of Antrim.

Once more we see that all the arts harmoniously worked together to produce the effect sought; all united in one "cosmic" expression, if we may be permitted to use the term. The cathedral with all its accessories and contents constituted an organic whole, though adapted to the performance of various functions. In its infinite diversity of detail the Gothic cathedral was a miniature representation or microcosm of heaven, that is, of the heaven of the mediæval imagination. On special occasions, when it was temporarily converted into a theatre, for the performance of the awful tragedy of the Passion, or some other Mystery or Miracle Play, before a rapt and tireless audience, it became a representation of both worlds. Heaven, hell, earth and purgatory were the shifting intermingling scenes of that tremendous and tumultuous drama, which, transcending the boundaries as well as the unities of time

and place, exhibited the Fall and Redemption, and foretold the ultimate condition of the human race, divided into good and bad, in the next world. Needless to add that the *dramatis personæ* included all kinds of supernatural beings. The Saviour, the Blessed Virgin, St. John the Baptist, St. Michael the Archangel, Lucifer, Beelzebub, etc., trod the boards with Adam, Abraham, Moses, Judas, Elias, St. Peter, Pontius Pilate, etc. There were also, as in the paintings and sculptures, allegorical characters in the plays, and personifications of the virtues and vices. Even God the Father Himself and the Trinity were brought on the stage. Heaven was nearer in those days than in these.

The Parthenon with its Phidian marbles, including the colossal statue of Athene herself; the Temple of Diana in Ephesus; the Hypostyle Hall in Karnac, and other temples in classic lands, have unquestionable claims to beauty and grandeur; but none of them could compare in sublimity or artistic power with such a building as the cathedral of Notre Dame, or that of Rheims, or that of Amiens, or that of St. Ouen in Rouen, or Westminster Abbey, or the cathedrals of Chartres, Cologne, Vienna, Seville, and Milan, or many others in England, France, Germany and Spain. Egyptian architecture is impressive, because of the scale on which it is constructed; but the impression it makes is that of mechanical power and prodigious physical labor, not of mental power. The proportions of Greek architecture are perfection itself, but it loved too much the horizontal line and never rose far from the ground. Gothic architecture soared sublime and shows incomparably more imagination and intellectual energy—more of the vision and faculty divine—more amplitude of plan and plenitude of adornment, and more constructive invention and intrepidity than the Greek. The Egyptian architecture it excels in every quality but mere magnitude, and probably in that, too, if we leave the pyramids out of account. The most poetic testimonial ever raised by man to his Maker, the sublimest prayer ever offered up to heaven, is the mediæval cathedral. Even that arch-enemy of Christianity, Comte, says: "The ideas and feelings of man's moral nature have never found so perfect expression in form as they found in the noble cathedrals of Catholicism."

Gothic architecture had its origin and purest development north of the Alps; but it spread into Italy, where it underwent modifications not congenial to its character. Nevertheless, nothing is more charming than Italian Gothic, impure though it may be. The upper church of St. Francis, in Assisi, was the first in the new style erected in that country, and was the work of a German architect. Assisi, as all authorities now admit, was the fountain-head of that bright river of art and poetry which, for three centuries, impara-

dised northern Italy, and filled churches, convents, palaces, and public buildings with those wonderful paintings, never equalled before or since, and with statues and all kinds of sculptures and other art-work of perhaps equal merit. We will not dwell on these wonderful productions, because many of them are still *en evidence* to prove, as it were, that all eulogy of them is inadequate and vain. Their fame is universal. The new era of mural painting was introduced by Cimabue, who executed several large frescos in the upper church of St. Francis. He was followed and excelled by Giotto, who has left noble monuments of his genius in churches and monasteries all the way from the Arena Chapel in Padua to San Chiara in Naples, but who can be best seen in the upper and lower churches in Assisi. He was preëminently the painter of St. Francis, and full of that inspiration which flowed in ample but varying measure down to the time of Julius the Second and Leo the Tenth. Neither religion nor art long maintained the lofty level of Giotto's day; but they sank and rose together. Apparently, it is not given to man to keep the heights he sometimes reaches. Our limits forbid us to single out either the names or works of even the first magnitude, which shed lustre on the long interval; nor is it necessary, for they are copiously written in art-literature and history. We must stick to our text, which is the dependence of art on religion; and in pursuance of this, we return for a moment to the religious movement originated by St. Francis, and the powerful creative impulse it gave to Italian art.

The preaching and example of that pure, gentle, and heroic spirit kindled the souls of earnest men, not only in the green valleys round Perugia and Assisi, but throughout Italy, and awakened the nations beyond the Alps and the Adriatic. When his majestic shrine arose on that steep eminence, within view of his native city, pictorial art in the form of fresco promptly appeared at it, with new splendor and with the combined merits of the illuminations and the old mosaics. The two currents were now united, and thenceforth flowed on together. Delicacy and variety of expression were added to breadth and dignity of design and largeness of scale. But neither miniature nor mosaic work ceased. On the contrary, miniature painting began to flourish more luxuriantly, until it culminated in the ineffable creations of Fra Angelico and Clovio.

Carried away by the enthusiasm of the Franciscan movement, men and women were but too eager to exchange the world for the higher life of the cloister. Churches, monasteries, oratories rose on all sides. Every altar must have an altar-piece; every chapel must be painted with illustrations of the life and miracles of the

saint to whom it is dedicated. Every refectory must have a picture of the Last Supper. The churches, especially those of Tuscany—birthplace of modern sculpture—must have statues. Their doors must be of bronze, empaneled with reliefs. The epic, of which our Saviour is the hero, meets our eyes once more on the gates of baptisteries and cathedrals. The marble altar must be carved like the marble pulpit, and enameled if made of metal; and even when the metal is precious, "*materiam superabat opus*" might be written on it. The high altar in St. Mark's, Venice, vouches for this. Necessarily there was a great deal of employment for artists, and emulation and rivalry among them. There was rivalry and emulation between the Franciscans and Dominicans, between the abbots and the bishops, between the secular and the regular clergy. Thus were created and developed both the material and spiritual conditions essential to the maintenance, progress, and perfection of Art. Naturally, technique progressed, until it reached the highest state. Art production of all kinds was a great industry in Florence and other places, and technical skill and the chemistry of colors were so generally understood and practised that when a great genius, like Michael Angelo or Raphael, appeared, he was very soon able to give full expression to his conceptions. New colors were discovered. Chiaroscuro was invented by Paulo Uccello, and perfected by Leonardo Da Vinci. Perspective, aerial and linear, was also invented, or reinvented. Mantagna, if not the founder of geometrical perspective, is the most conspicuous name associated with it; and aerial perspective was an open secret of the studios in the days of Perugino and Francia; and, it is said, began with that same Paulo Uccello, the greatest *naturalist* that preceded Leonardo. Thus, "light and shade," foreshortening, and perspective of both kinds, were brought to a state of perfection unknown to the ancients by the science of successive generations of artists who worked almost exclusively for the Church. In like manner the continual repetition of the ancient themes was productive of nobler designs and compositions, and the individual types approached nearer and nearer to the ideal standard. The Virgin continued to grow more divinely beautiful, and the saints more godlike, as each master strove to surpass his predecessors and contemporaries. Then oil as the medium of the palette-pigments came into use through the Van Eycks, of Bruges, illustrious in sacred art, greatly enhancing the power of the brush and the magic both of color and chiaroscuro. When the great minds of the *cinque cento* appeared in Umbria, Florence, Sienna, Venice, all heaven and happy constellations smiled on them, and the Pontiffs crowned them with wealth and honor. True, the work of Perugino, Raphael, Michael Angelo, Leonardo, Titian, and

their contemporaries and immediate forerunners, was not exclusively religious. The antique had been revived before—but not long before—their advent. Squarcione, full of zeal for antiquity, had collected a museum of antique marbles in Padua, and Montagna, his pupil, painted the triumphs of Julius Cæsar, and other Roman subjects, in the old Roman style. Statues in marble and bronze, and sculptured tombs, had been dug up in various places, and Rome abounded in such subjects, or rather in their fragments and *débris*. The excavations in the Baths of Titus revealed all the secrets of ancient mural painting, and new and beautiful decorative forms, to Raphael. The summer of the Renaissance had come with the fall of Constantinople and the hegira to the west of Byzantine artists and men of letters, who carried with them medals, enamels, illuminations, engraved gems, and manuscripts in Greek, Latin and Arabic. The great wealth of the house of Medici enabled them to gather into Florence much of this artistic and literary spoil, native and foreign, and the City of Flowers became thenceforth the capital of the neo-Paganism and neo-Platonism.

The worship of classic literature and art, and the poetical revival of the classic mythology, produced results that neither Dante nor Petrarch foresaw. The movement carried corruption, egoism, and cynicism into politics, social life, city life, and letters in the higher circles, and tainted the moral atmosphere generally with the heavy odors from the newly opened grave of Paganism,—a system which, in its final stages of decomposition, reeked with a licentiousness so vile that Nemesis had buried it ages ago under the mountain ruins of an empire. Art did not wholly escape the contagion. The immediate effect on it was the glorification of mere physical beauty, especially in the female form, and the rehabilitation of those episodes in mythology which recounted the amours and galantries of the Olympian deities, and which on that account afforded a choice field for the display of the nude. Jupiter and Danae, Jupiter and Io, Jupiter and Leda, Jupiter and Europa, Pluto and Proserpine, Mars and Venus, Hercules and Omphales, Paris and Helen, Æneas and Dido, nymph and satyr, and a whole cycle of such subjects employed part of the time of the great masters of the Renaissance. These gods and goddesses lived again in all the beauty of the Parthenon marbles, but they were now conceived under the inspiration of the Muse of Comedy, and, of course, were destitute of their pristine sincerity and grandeur. The artists had tasted of the Circean cup of which the princes and nobles had drunk deep, and ministered nothing loth to the fantasy which was all the rage, and which was certainly the most artificial and shadowy *cult* the imagination of man had ever devised. But despite the popularity of goddess and nymph, of the muses and the

graces, religious art maintained its ascendancy. The rulers and the ruling class, the Borgias and the Medici, the Malatestas and the Estes, the Sforzas, the Viscontis and the Gonzagas, the Colonnas, the Cenci, the Orsini, the Savelli,—the men for whom Machiavelli, Pulci and Aretino wrote and Marc Antonio plied the burin, might call for glowing sensual forms in the nude to decorate their chambers, but the churches and abbeys were still the chief patrons of the painters, sculptors, goldsmiths, bronzists, embroiderists, and tapestry weavers. The ethical element still predominated in art and art industries. The juxtaposition of great art and great crime in Italy at this period has given rise to the theory that there is no necessary connection between the former and the moral condition of the people among whom it flourishes. In other words, fine art may be produced in a spiritually degenerate age, and by men of immoral lives. This theory rests on a few superficial generalizations which the study of Italian history dissipates. It is true that artists and poets, like monks and priests, may fall and often do fall from grace; but their youthful inspirations never wholly abandon them, and their manual skill and science remain. True, Raphael and Cæsar Borgia were contemporaries and acquaintances, as the alleged portrait of the latter by the former in the Palazzo Borghese would appear to demonstrate. True statecraft, at that time Cisalpine as well as Transalpine, put falsehood, treachery and assassination in the category of permissible political expedients. True, the festal cup might be loaded with death and the dagger of the bravo might be hired. But these things were confined to narrow spots and few, and to a class numerically small—to the courts of certain dukes and counts, descendants for the most part of condottieri and Ghibelline adventurers whose rule began in violence and robbery. The people comprising the agricultural population, the clergy, the monastic, artistic and industrial associations, were free as yet from the contagion of the *cinque cento*. The poison from above works slowly, though it works surely, through the body politic. The coexistence in time of high-art production and high crime in Italy is no more paradoxical than the coexistence in time of the judicial murders, wholesale spoliation and atrocious tyranny of Henry VIII. and his minions on one side, and the saintly lives and heroic deaths of Sir Thomas More, Fisher and the other martyrs of that reign, lately beatified, on the other side. The holy hills of Umbria were still alive with the fire St. Francis brought down from Heaven. The artists, their ecclesiastical clients, and the people were yet in sympathy. When the artist meditating a great work essayed to climb the highest heaven of invention, and clothe his forms with godlike grandeur or the ideal beauty of the angelic world, he rose on the wings of Faith, and contemptuously spurned

the shadows and the shades of the Pantheon. There is no extravagance in believing that inspiration from the highest source may have sometimes dictated the plan or the design and nerved the master's hand. The idea that religious masterpieces were achieved through special gifts of grace was not unfamiliar then, and does not seem improbable now, though we are all so skeptical. Vittoria Colonna, the noblest woman of her age, thus writes to Michael Angelo: "I had a profound belief that God would grant you a *supernatural faith* to paint this Christ; and I found it so admirable as to exceed all that I had been able to imagine: and, animated by your miracles, I wished for that which I now see marvellously fulfilled, that is, that it should be perfect in every respect; more could not be desired or even hoped for. I must tell you that I rejoice that the angel on the right hand is so beautiful, for the Archangel Michael will place you, Michael Angelo, on the right of the Lord on that new day." Michael Angelo himself, anticipating Milton's celebrated saying about the poet, declares "that in order to represent our Lord it is not only necessary for the artist to be a man of genius, but also holy, so that he may be inspired by the Holy Spirit." These ideas were not confined to him or his illustrious correspondent. They were in fact traditional; and not he only, but many another great architect, sculptor, and painter, could say with the Psalmist, "O Lord, I have loved the beauty of Thy House, and the place where Thy glory dwelleth!" Not a few of the most celebrated artists of the time were themselves priests and monks, and spent their lives in the cloister. "Sacerdos et Magister" was not an uncommon title. This is especially true of the miniaturists, who now raised miniature painting to the highest pinnacle of Christian art. We return to them for a moment. Their importance is not sufficiently salient in art literature. Shut in from the world, the world was shut out from their works. The choral books, missals, and other manuscripts contained in the public collections of Europe, are interleaved with ideal compositions that may be justly called the flower of purely Christian art, that is, of the art which expressed the purely Christian virtues without any admixture of the secular or "humanist" element. The works of the Siennese school and of the school of Fra Angelico are steeped in divine mysticism. The Annunciation, the Coronation of the Blessed Virgin, Paradise, St. Francis in ecstasy, St. Catharine in ecstasy, "her rapt soul sitting in her eyes," St. Bernardine, St. Thomas Aquinas, and all those whose souls took seraph flights to Heaven, and sojourned round the Holy Mount while their bodies yet walked the earth, are the favorite themes. Christian art in the ethic sense reached its apogee in the illuminations.

We pause for the present with the following brief summing up:

The poetic inspiration, which is the distinctive quality of great art down to the "Reformation," came from Christianity; the science, the taste, the skill, in brief, the technique, by means of which genius was enabled to body forth the forms of things unseen, and without which the figures on the vault of the Sistine and in the Stanze della Segnatura might have remained mere images in the minds of their authors, was the creation of the Catholic Church, which imperatively demanded art from the beginning, and gave artists a never-failing field for their labor, and kept the loftiest ideals before their eyes.

JOHANNES JANSSEN, GERMANY'S GREAT HISTORIAN.

TO the student of history it is gratifying to note the present interest of non-Catholic peoples in the scientific school of historians who have done, and are doing, so much to diffuse a dispassionate knowledge of past fact. The attempt of the tyrannical State-churches,—fabricated by the politicians who manipulated the so-called reform movements of the sixteenth century,—to impose themselves permanently upon communities, great and small, was a fruitful cause of the Protestant obscurantism, which has long retarded progress in the higher walks of the intellectual life, to the deep regret of the informed and thinking men of to-day. When the shibboleth, "Religion," failed to effect the purposes of dynasties and parties, the watchword, "Education," was substituted as a rallying cry for those whose lease of power depended on the success of a policy of retrogression, backed by qualified ignorance. The State-school and University replaced decayed churches as agents in the work of limiting or misdirecting inquiry, and of systematizing falsehood, thus shackling the human mind, and depriving coming generations of a mass of real knowledge, painfully acquired. So insidious were the workings of both the older and the newer system, that the Protestant populations, who were being injured by the one or the other, remained wholly unconscious of their benighted condition. Even to-day—and among our progressive and sagacious countrymen—there is a remnant of well-meaning and intelligent non-Catholics, who, by their amusing assumption of supereminent and incontrovertible

knowledge, serve as witnesses to the density of the lingering vapors which still befog a rapidly decreasing minority of fairly educated men. Shall we not rejoice that the fog is lifting, speedily lifting, and that there is good reason to hope that the people, who have been crowded into the valley of darkness, will soon see the glorious light, and feel the vital glow of the sun of truth?

Among the enthusiastic workers in the cause of popular enlightenment, no one, of late, has been more conspicuous than Johannes Janssen, and, probably, no work, since the so-called Reformation, has done more to awaken inquiry among Protestants than the "History of the German People since the Close of the Middle Ages." The interest excited by the first volume has grown with each succeeding volume. Fourteen editions, twenty-eight thousand copies, of the fifth volume, which came from the press in the autumn of 1886, had been issued and sold before the end of the year. A like demand for so large and serious a work was unheard-of in Germany, and has been seldom equalled in any other country. And it is a noteworthy fact that, in North Germany—non-Catholic Germany—the History has had a larger circulation than in the Catholic districts. A masterpiece in its line, it has commanded praise from scholars of every shade of political and religious thought. Von Holst, whose "History of the Constitution of the United States" has made him favorably known to American readers, publicly expressed the opinion that "Janssen's work was a power among the German people, indeed, a formative factor in the development of their civilization;" and Janssen he pronounced "the most learned and best read man in his special line of studies—a man who has done an immeasurable service to history, the inaugurator of a new era in the science of history." Nor have English or French critics been less prompt in paying tribute to the learning, originality and scientific method of the German historian.

A good, as well as great, scholar, the story of Janssen's life, and a review, however imperfect, of his writings—for he had given varied proof of a wide and liberal training, of broad and deep thought, of a rare power of analysis, and of a clear and flexible style, long before the publication of his master-work—may serve as example and as spur to our own youth, and cannot but prove useful to those who have read, or who may be led to read, his able history.

Johannes Janssen was born on the tenth of April, 1829, at the old town of Xanten—home of the Niebelungen, birthplace of Siegfried—where his father, Gerhard, a simple burgher, who had been a guardsman at Potsdam, under Blücher, earned a living by keeping shop. Johanna Gertrude Remmen, his mother, a pious and

charitable woman, lived to love him and to train him in good ways only till his thirteenth year. After her death, the father married the daughter of one Lahaye, a coppersmith, and young Janssen was forthwith apprenticed to the trade. He had shown an early fondness for books. The first to awaken in him a love for history was a good aunt. He was just eight years old when she made him a present of a volume of Annegarn's "Universal History." They were on a pilgrimage to famed Kevalaer, when she picked it out from among the treasures of an old book-stall, whose shelves she was rummaging. Constant reading of this odd volume supplied Johannes with many wondrous stories about the latter part of the Middle Ages, and these he was accustomed to rehearse to a willing audience of Xanten boys. To the smith's shop he brought books and stories. When he could escape the master's watchful eye, he dropped the hammer and read the books, or instructed and distracted his fellow-workmen with tales of mighty men and deeds. Master Lahaye was a judge of more than pots and pans; "I like John very much," said he to a friend, "but he will never make a coppersmith, and a scholar will be lost into the bargain." Happily, there were others who saw that the boy was not made for a coppersmith. At the Rectorat-schule, where he had spent two years, he attracted the notice of the rector, who now prevailed upon his father to take him from the smithy and send him back to school. Time justified the rector. Devoting himself especially to history and literature, Janssen proved not merely an apt but a painstaking student. In the autumn of 1846 he was sent to the Gymnasium at Recklinghausen, where, not neglecting other studies, he diligently enlarged his view of the world's history, under the historian, Heumann. Leaving the Gymnasium in 1849, he entered the Münster Academy, and began a course of theology. Thence he went to Louvain, in the spring of 1850, where he followed the lectures on theology and philosophy. But history was not put aside. Among the many able men at the University were Möller, the historian of the Middle Ages, and Feye, the canonist, a Hollander, who had made a special study of the history of the Netherlands. To these teachers Janssen attached himself, and under each of them he worked effectively. As the result of the year's studies, he published "The Genesis of the Revolution in the Low-Countries," which first appeared in the German edition of the *Civiltà-Cattolica*. His health, never vigorous, now failed him; and, believing himself unequal to the care of souls, he gave up theological studies, and devoted his time to linguistics and history. In the fall of 1851 he went to Bonn, where—under Joseph Aschbach, who had already established a reputation by his works on the West-Goths, the Heruli and Gepi-

dæ, and the Emperor Sigmund—he made further progress in the science of historical inquiry. After two years at the University, having, meantime, taken the degree of Ph.D., he returned to his father's house at Xanten. There he completed his first important work, a biography of "Wibald, of Stablo and Corvey." (Münster, 1854.)

In this scholarly study, Janssen, besides doing justice to a great man and leader of men, revived the troublous, pregnant age in which he lived. The twelfth century holds a forward place in the history of philosophy and theology, on account of the labors of Abelard, Roscelin, Anselm, Peter Lombard and Gratian. But the influence of the great clerics of the time was not limited to schools of learning. It extended over a far wider sphere. Thomas à Becket, Suger of St. Denis, and St. Bernard, were not only honored directors of men in things spiritual, but the trusted counsellors of kings, and at times even the real governors of kingdoms. History, while popularizing their names and deeds, has treated their great German contemporary and friend, the monk Wibald, with scant courtesy. Skilled in the liberal arts, as well as in theology, canon law, medicine and agriculture; well-read in sacred and profane literature; a student of the classics, a clever writer, a masterly orator, a trained philosopher, and, what was rare in his days, a Greek scholar—"the most learned man of his time," Wibald was, throughout his life, a forwarder of learning. The monks under his charge copied books and wrote chronicles, while he was active in improving the schools and in founding libraries. His piety and ability fitted him especially for the work of monastic reform which he early took in hand. The disordered condition of Germany, due to constant wars within and without the Empire, the constant friction between Church and State, and the greed and ambitions of spiritual as well as temporal princes, had proved doubly hurtful to the religious life. Not only was the spirit of monasticism weakened, and the rule neglected, but the property of many monasteries was seized, revenues were confiscated and buildings destroyed. Wibald fought force with force, directed armies, put down robber knights with the one sword, and rebellious monks with the other; rebuilt abbeys and churches, built protecting fortresses, founded towns, and established industries. As Abbot of Stablo, in Lorraine, he ruled over sixty-three churches, towns and bishoprics. So successfully did he administer this great trust for sixteen years that the monks of Corvey, in Saxony, famed for its schools and its charities, elected him Abbot in 1146. From that time until his death in 1158, he struggled manfully under the double burden he unwillingly assumed. Nine years before his election to Corvey he had been chosen Abbot of Monte Cassino;

but King Roger of Sicily, who preferred a churchman more to his own liking, overran the abbey lands and besieged the monastery. For peace sake, not through cowardice, Wibald resigned the office and fled. It was Henry V. who first called Wibald to court, in 1122 or 1123. His powerful personality, his patriotism, his broad views, thorough acquaintance with the science and art of contemporary diplomacy, and quick and true measure of men and circumstances, made a deep impression on the Emperor. The Abbot's influence was quickly felt in Church and State affairs, and this influence grew year by year until his death. Under Lothair III., Conrad III., and Frederick Barbarossa, Wibald was a power in the land; an adviser, a mediator, an ambassador, a military leader, but always, and above all, a "prince of peace," as Lothair called him. When Lothair descended into Italy (1136) he made the Benedictine admiral of the imperial fleet; when Conrad, moved by the fire of Bernard's eloquence, went to the crusades, in 1146, he placed the reins of government in Wibald's hands, and for three years the whole diplomatic activity of Germany was centred in the monk. The fiery Frederick, "the lord of the world," as he loved to call himself, whose "will was law," as he boasted, was held in check by the same monk, his friend and trusted counsellor, who died in his service. It was only after the great Abbot's death that Barbarossa, misled by less prudent advisers, definitely adopted a policy of opposition to the Papacy; a policy which aimed at "the total overthrow of the spiritual power, the complete separation of the Church in Germany from the Church of Rome, and the establishment of a German Pope as against the Pope of Rome." It is a fashion of some of the literary *cordons-bleus* of to-day to serve up a hodge-podge of "Reformers before the Reform," compounded out of the bones of blessed saints and unblessed heretics. Why has Frederick been left out of the dish?

Serving Germany well, and honored by his temporal sovereigns, Wibald was no less a faithful servant of the Church, and no less honored by her rulers. Five successive Popes, Innocent II., Celestine II., Lucius II., Eugenius III., Anastasius IV., and Hadrian IV., esteemed him as a friend, and carried on important negotiations with him and through him. Confident of his loyalty, they freely called him to their aid, when the rights of the Church were endangered. With tact and firmness, he sought to harmonize the frequent differences between the Empire and the Papacy, and to determine the practical limits of the civil and the spiritual power. Janssen's life of Wibald was a helpful contribution to the study of the civilization of the twelfth century, as well as of the course of political events in Germany, France, Italy and the East. Not only were students made acquainted with a forgotten man, who had

played a great part in the world's history, but they were directed to precious sources of exact information—to Wibald's letters and literary remains, which are invaluable to the historian, as well as to statesmen and jurists. To the young student, a review of the notes and appendices will be instructive; and here, in America, where the study of history is so neglected, and the College Historical Society is generally more effective in fixing bad methods than in teaching good ones, the reading of this small volume, or a correct translation of it, might prove more beneficial and more fruitful than a year's "essays."

Having seen his book through the press, Janssen went to Berlin, where he passed the summer of 1854, attending the lectures of the more famous professors at the university, and making good use of the great libraries. Later in the same year he returned to Münster, and took a position at the academy as *privat-docent* in history. Shortly afterwards he was called to the Catholic professorship of history in the Frankfurt Gymnasium; and finding the place agreeable, he retained it until 1860.

Frankfurt was at this time the home of a number of gifted men, whose varied tastes served to bind them more closely in social intercourse. The young professor was gladly welcomed to a circle which included Johann David Passavant, Beda Weber, Edward von Steinle, August Reichensperger, and Johann Friedrich Böhmer. Passavant, a studious artist, whose "*Le Peintre Graveur*" is in every print collector's library, was known over Europe, rather by his literary work than his paintings. The "*Life of Raphael and of his Father Giovanni Santi*," and the "*Christian Art in Spain*," had given him a deserved reputation as an original inquirer and thinker. Weber, a poet, had, in earlier life, sung the beauties and the hopes of his own peaceful, lovely Tyrol; but was now engaged in the more practical work of historical writing. Von Steinle, friend and pupil of Overbeck and Cornelius, and one of the most able and thoughtful painters of the century, was teaching at the Städel Institute. He had already found encouragement in his efforts to fix the good traditions of fresco and of a truly decorative Christian art, which his able masters had revived; and which he so worthily continued at Castle Rheineck, in the Imperial Hall at Frankfurt, the cathedrals of Cologne, Strassburg and Frankfurt, and St. Egidius, at Münster. Reichensperger, so widely known of late years as the founder of the "*Centre*" party, and as one of its ablest leaders during the darker days of the *Kultur-kampf*, had been a member of the Frankfurt Parliament of 1848, and was not without reputation in the political world when the young professor of history met him. He had, however, been less a student of statecraft than of Christian art and architecture, subjects to which

he is to-day devoted, though in his eightieth year. His writings on these subjects had helped to renew an interest in the grand works of the Romanesque and Gothic periods, and to incite his countrymen to seek in them a larger science and a higher inspiration. Through Frau Schlosser, in whose *salon* these bright, serious men were often brought together, Janssen formed a life-long friendship with Wilhelm Molitor, the Dean of Speyer cathedral, whose finished verse and charming closet-dramas have fixed his name in German literature.

It was, however, with Johann Friedrich Böhmer, then in his sixtieth year, who had been the Librarian at Frankfurt for a quarter of a century, that Janssen entered into closest intimacy ; an intimacy based not only on a common interest in the study of history, but on a mutual appreciation of each other's character and abilities. Lord Acton, in a learned article which he contributed to the first number of the "English Historical Magazine" (January, 1886), hits off Böhmer smartly in these few words : "Among the historians of that epoch"—the second quarter of this century—"the most eminent, though he never wrote a page of history, was Böhmer. Of him it can be said that he raised drudgery to the rank of a fine art." Drudgery, a word implying ignoble toil, is most unfortunately applied to one of the noblest workers and highest minds of this or any other age. Johann Friedrich Böhmer was born at Frankfurt, April 22d, 1795, of a Lutheran father and a Calvinist mother. His grandfather had been, in his day, a Kammer-rath at Zweibrücken in the Palatinate; and there Johann's father had studied and practised law until the French invasion compelled him to seek a more secure home at Frankfurt. Through his mother, also, Böhmer was connected with a family of lawyers, the Von Hoffmans, of Wetzlar. From his earliest years, both sides of the house set purposeful study before him as a duty he owed his Maker and mankind. Having enjoyed the advantages of the best education Frankfurt afforded, and the disadvantages of a hard, narrow, though well-meaning home, he was sent to Heidelberg, in 1813, to study jurisprudence; a profession he had chosen not from any special liking, but "for want of a better." While conscientiously following his course, he gave much time to the study of philology, and read over a wide range of literature, "pen in hand, so that the reading might serve him." From the modest heights of the Königs-stuhl and along the Neckar's banks, he caught his first glimpse of the beauties of nature; and a new-born enthusiasm made him forever her lover and poet. After a year at Heidelberg, he went to Göttingen, where, though working honestly and methodically, he grew less and less interested in law. He took up history, physiology, natural history, art, early German poetry,

—indeed, every study that could help him to an “*all-seitige harmonische Bildung*.” When, in 1817, he received the degree of doctor of laws, he had already resolved to use his acquirements for high aims. His father’s death, within a month after graduation, and his parting injunction: “Fear God, keep His Commandments, and be a man!” rather strengthened than weakened this resolve.

Left in comfortable circumstances, Böhmer set about finding worthy occupation. On a visit to Heidelberg, in 1818, he saw the Boisserée collection of early German paintings, and received from it a new revelation about art, and a glimmering of the meaning of the words “Christian art.” Later in the year he journeyed to Rome, where good fortune brought him into friendly relations with the band of serious and gifted painters who had grouped themselves around Cornelius and Overbeck. During his five months’ companionship with these many-sided men, he studied painting, architecture and engraving; and acquired new views not only about art, but about history and religion. His good parents thought they had a religion, and they gave him what they had. He found out that instead of “teaching him truths, they had merely given him riddles.” Up to this time he had no real conception of a Church, beyond that of a building which covered a dull preacher. The religious teaching and philosophy of the Universities had made him a free-thinker, a disciple of Spinoza and Goethe. But the study of the Christian art of the Middle Ages carried him back into the stream of Christianity; more than that, it made him see that the conditions under which such an art had flourished, and the ideas that inspired it, must be far other than teachers or books had thus far told him.

Returning home, he consecrated his life once more to useful work. In the study of art he thought he might be able to do best service. He travelled over Germany to acquaint himself with its architecture, painting and sculpture. His notes, systematically arranged, rapidly grew to such proportions that he planned a *Catalogue raisonné* of all early German works of art. This was to serve as the introductory volume of a history of architecture. Unfortunately, he was appointed one of the Administrators of the Städel Art Institute, in 1822, and the notes were never edited. In accepting this position, he hoped to be able to establish an art-school which should rightly influence both the national and religious life. Experience taught him, however, that his colleagues’ ideas and his own differed radically. Time brought them no nearer together, and at length, after six years of vain effort, Böhmer resigned. This was the turning-point of his life; he determined to give himself up wholly to history. The careful study of early German art had given him a closer view of the Middle Ages, and

convinced him of his countrymen's ignorance of their past. Hence-forward his life-aim was to be the acquirement and the spread of a true knowledge about that past. As Catholic art had made him Christian, so Catholic historians taught him how to be an historian. His models were Baronius, Muratori, Mabillon and the French Benedictines. Just as the old Benedictines devoted their lives to seeking out the truth of history, so would he devote his life. *Vitam impendere vero*, written in letters of gold, stood ever before his eyes. With Mabillon, he believed that "the true roses of knowledge bloom only for the humble inquirer." Love of country, the conviction that a right knowledge of the past should be helpful for the future, the hope that truth might lead to good, these high motives, and not curiosity, fancy or ambition, determined his work and its direction. The main thing to do was to seek out and uncover the "Sources." He became one of the founders of the "Society for the Study of Early German History;" served as its secretary, and assisted in compiling and publishing its archives and in editing Pertz's "*Monumenta*." He was pleased to call himself "an historian's apprentice;" he was trying "to lay good foundations, and to gather stones wherewith others might build." In February, 1829, he began the "Imperial Regesta," which he published in 1831. A second volume, "Regesta of the Carolingians," appeared in 1833. The "Frankfurt Roll-book" came out in 1836; the "Regesta of Louis of Bavaria" in 1839; a first volume of a new work, "Fontes rerum Germanicarum," in 1843; a first volume of a second series of "Imperial Regesta" in 1844; a second volume of the "Fontes," in 1845; another volume of the "Regesta," in 1846; a third, in 1847; a fourth, in 1848; a fifth, in 1849; a third volume of "Fontes," in 1853; and a sixth volume of the "Regesta," in 1854. Probably we can best estimate the character of these works from Wattenbach's review of them in his learned "Sources of German History" (*Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, 1885). "In the more recent editions, the Regesta received an ever-widening extension; the short extracts from the records were made more full, and were connected by means of extracts from the history-writers and the Annals. The whole of the historical material of a period is placed in order before the eye of the historical inquirer; and in the 'Prefaces,' the original authorities are discussed and appreciated." "In addition to this work of such exceeding service to historical studies, Böhmer, on account of the careless editing of the later Chronicles, and the valuable manuscript material he had gathered, was prompted to publish the 'Fontes rerum Germanicarum' in three volumes; a special collection of original authorities, which is of exceptional value for the

period between the end of the eleventh and the beginning of the fourteenth centuries."

Himself no dilettante, Wattenbach says that, "alone, Böhmer did more than most societies ; and from him the most stimulating and vivifying influence was radiated in all directions." During the twenty-five years he gave to his great works, he travelled almost yearly, in Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, France or Italy, that he might make more extended and exact inquiries among the libraries and archives. He also kept up a wide correspondence with learned fellow-countrymen and foreigners. Everywhere and in every way he sought to spread a love for truth, and modest devotion to the study of the past. His purse was open to aid less fortunate men, whose work halted for lack of means. There was no German of rank in any literary walk, who did not know him ; yet, he sought especially the companionship of young men, not merely to keep his own mind fresh and open, but also that he might interest them in study and lead them to labor for truth's sake.

The more he pushed his inquiries, the more Catholic he became. His countrymen's views of the Church he boldly pronounced the result of ignorance. He seriously considered a plan for establishing a fund, to be controlled by Catholics, so that German history would be written as they would write it ; he contributed of his means to the publication of works helpful to a history of the Church ; he encouraged bishops and churchmen to cultivate and forward the study of Church history ; and, what is still more noteworthy, he maintained that our hopes for the elevation of the human race and the reunion of Christendom can be realized only through the agency of a more generally educated and a highly educated priesthood. Böhmer might be described as an "historical Catholic." He never joined the Church, but he declared that he had never protested against her. So fervent a Catholic as Clemens Brentano said of him : "He is as Catholic as I am." Many of his friends were converted. He applauded them all. Their courage, the sacrifices they necessarily made, called forth his admiration. Reason, as well as history, made clear to him that the Church could be but one, and must be visible. "An invisible Church was as nonsensical as an invisible painter." He looked and hoped and worked for Christian union. Had any number of those of his father's denomination, the Lutheran, gone over in a body to the Church, he would have gone with them. And yet he was no Lutheran. While he felt secure in the Church's position, on the historical side, he thought his study of her doctrine had been too slight to justify him in formally uniting himself with her communion. During his last illness he was nursed by a Brother of Charity, and again and again did he testify how much he had

learned from him as to what true Christian charity was. In emulation of the monks he so much admired, he had led a simple, sober life; a life of self-denial, filled with charitable actions, and regulated by a severe rule; a life of labor devoted to a single aim. A true historian, his "drudgery" was the rare sacrifice of a conscientious student, who sweats in untilled fields that others may reap full ears after him.

Janssen's views of history and historians were quite those of the great scholar whose pupil he had become. It is easy to conceive how helpful Böhmer's direction and suggestion must have been to him. He had already planned his life-work: a history of the German people. Böhmer had been the first to applaud his purpose and to encourage him in the undertaking. Acknowledging a copy of "*Abbot Wibald*," in 1854, he wrote to Janssen: "There is no nobler or more useful task than a recital of the history of the Germans, popular in a high sense, which, making as much use as possible of existing researches, and condensing the essentials, speaks to the cultivated circles of the public in vigorous language; and I honor him who, still a young man, sets such a noble task before himself. By high and noble aims must we lift ourselves upward, and from them must we draw strength, courage and self-denial." Under Böhmer's eyes, Janssen worked at the "*Imperial Regesta*" from 1854 to 1857. Then, having determined to limit the scope of his history, he turned his attention almost wholly to the study of the closing period of the Middle Ages, and to modern times. Meanwhile, his sense of vocation to the priesthood had not been weakened; and, health permitting, he quietly withdrew from Frankfurt in 1860, and went to Tübingen to prepare for ordination. Here he was again fortunate in being associated with such an able man as Karl Josef von Hefele, who, nine years later, was made Bishop of Rottenburg, and who, having contributed so largely to the right knowledge of Church history, archaeology and liturgy, had made scholardom for all time indebted to him by his great "*History of the Christian Councils*" (1855-74).

On March 21st, 1860, Janssen was ordained in the Cathedral at Limburg, and from that day onward he has been as devoted to the duties of his priestly office as to his favorite study. The Church offered him honors, but he declined them: they would interfere with his life-work—from his fixed aim nothing should distract him. Having given much time to the Frankfurt Archives, he now undertook the publication of "*Frankfurt's Imperial Correspondence and other Related Documents*" (2 vols., 1863-1873), which covered the period from King Wenzel (1400) to the death of Maximilian I. (1519). The original researches, of which these volumes were the result, and the wholly new material they con-

tained, made their value permanent. A critic in the "Historisch-Politische Blätter" paid them a deserved tribute in saying that "no historian of the end of the Middle Ages will conclude a chapter of his book without consulting Janssen's 'Reichs-Correspondenz.' It is as indispensable to the historian as the Breviary to the priest." Reference to the more recent works on this period will show how serviceable it has been, and the high estimation in which it is held.

In the very same year in which he printed the first volume of this important contribution to historical science, Janssen published a work of no less practical service to the cause of historic truth : "Schiller as a Historian" (Freiburg, 1863). Among German writers who have helped to spread a wholly false view of the history of their own country, and indeed of history in general, no one has been more harmful than Schiller. His poetic power, the popularity of his ballads, of the "Song of the Bell," of the "Hymn to Joy"—which Beethoven made immortal by his use of it as a choral climax to the grand Ninth symphony—his affiliations with the "idol" Goethe, his brilliant prose style, his dramatic works, and a general feeling that he was a well-meaning man, gave a repute to the history of the "Revolt in the Netherlands," and of "The Thirty Years' War," of which they were quite undeserving. The German originals and the Bohn translations have served to misinform more than one generation of credulous readers, and the harm done has been all the more effective because of Schiller's large and continuous influence among the classes that assume to be "cultivated." No one better than the poet knew how unfitted he was to write the truth about history ; but his very want of training, the peculiar notions he entertained about literary art, and above all, material necessities, made him blind to the requirements and the serious obligations of the man who would write history. The poet's literary friends knew his ignorance ; he openly regretted it, or joked about it ; contemporary critics spoke of it. Serious historians, long ago, rated him as he deserved, and pointed out his most flagrant errors or misstatements in foot-notes, or transiently referred to them in their pages. As long ago as 1809 Niebuhr wrote : "This autumn I read Schiller's 'History of the Thirty Years' War,' and again and again did I clasp my hands in amazement, not carried away by the work—oh ! by no means, but astounded at the possibility that a book like this, which is not even tolerably well written, and whose narrative halts and stumbles, should be stamped as a classic. Time will do justice, and smother the thing." Unfortunately for the cause of truth, justice is often slow. For more than fifty years Niebuhr's prophecy was not fulfilled, and the imaginative pot-a-boilers which Schiller threw off

for the entertainment of the readers of the "Mercury," the "Hours" and the "Ladies' Calendar," bound in well printed volumes, still furnished the cultivated public with what they assumed was history. But Janssen's thorough study of "Schiller as a Historian" at last did Schiller and the public justice, and "smothered the thing" and the historian. Janssen always comes to his work with full hands. Whatever his subject, you see that he has provided himself with every bit of principal and accessory material needed to develop the subject fully. He may not say the last word, but he has certainly given you the facts from which to frame that word. The Schiller study is as lively and suggestive as it is complete and convincing. In his letters the poet tells the story of his historical education, of how and why he became a writer on historical subjects, of his ideas about history, and of the methods he pursued in the manufacture of history. It is an amusing and instructive story. Simply ignorant, always poetic, fanciful, constructing history "out of himself," not above a little charlatanry, disliking his compelled work, carried away by every wind of so-called philosophy, filled with false conceptions concerning the facts and the ideas of the past, Schiller is a type of the "historian" who has served and still serves to mislead youth and age in every country, about many important facts of history, ancient or modern. In Janssen's hands, Schiller dissects himself. Not content, however, with the self-convicting result of this operation, Janssen critically examines the poet's unhistorical works, thoroughly and authoritatively corrects them, and in addition gives a clear and close statement of the true causes and the actual progress of the Revolution in the Netherlands and of the Thirty Years' War. Nor does the value of this little book end here. It is filled with suggestive details about the Weimar coterie, the scope of education at the German universities in the beginning of this century, and the scholarship, ideals and methods of modern French and German history writers,—subjects on which Janssen, both here and in a later volume of essays, has shed "more light" than Goethe or his school can well bear. The honest student, and the honest reader of history, will thank the author for his admirable statement of the principles which underlie all right historical work; a statement positively helpful to the formation of a true critical judgment.

The "Schiller as a Historian" was, in one respect, only an appendix to work already done. In "France's Craving for the Rhine; and her anti-German policy in former centuries" (Frankfurt, 1861; 3d ed. Freiburg, 1883), published two years before the Schiller study, Janssen laid a heavy hand on the whole school of writers who had indoctrinated the people with the false and harmful notion that the Thirty Years' War was "a war of the Lord,"

and for "the freedom of the Gospel." Of this book Böhmer said that it had clearly shown, "even to Protestant democrats, that the Thirty Years' War was much more a political than a religious war." This, indeed, it showed conclusively, and with admirable method. These hundred pages are replete not only with well-selected facts, but with practical instruction in the art of clear, analytic presentation; an art not easily acquired, and much neglected in the schools. The title of the book discloses its scope and the writer's patriotic spirit. Among the canting phrase-makers of "real, original" modern politics, and we have as many of them in the United States as they have in England, France, Germany or Italy, there is a common agreement to charge Catholics with a radical want of patriotism, due to the teaching and organization of the Church. History is a sufficient answer to this childish accusation. Those who will not read history, would certainly be convinced, even if they were not silenced by Janssen's book, which is marked from beginning to end by a deep, warm feeling of undivided love for the Fatherland, and by a hearty indignation against French policy and rule. Considerable light is thrown upon the present strained relations of the two countries, and upon the important Rhine question, in this finished sketch. An enmity of seven hundred years is not to be healed in a day; and France, which first sought a lodgment in the Rhine-land nine hundred years ago, has been a recognized enemy of Germany since the eleventh century. The French policy has indeed been discreditable, and often contemptible. Nevertheless, even before the religious divisions in Germany, that policy found numerous purchased supporters within the Empire itself. When the Empire was torn asunder by the "Reformation" troubles, the German "Reformed" princes hastened to throw themselves into the arms of the traditional enemy, and were proud of betraying their own country in return for booty, power or pay. The great ambition of the French kings was to wear the Imperial crown; failing in this, they adopted a policy, whose object was the destruction of the Empire itself. Francis I., Henry II., Charles IX., Henry III. and IV., and Louis XIII. and XIV.—that is to say, Richelieu and Mazarin—worked to the same end by the same immoral means. The Peace of Westphalia (1648) sealed the fate of the Empire, and handed over to the French long coveted Alsace. To the Catholic student of history, Janssen's narration of the part played by the "eldest son of the Church," during the "Reformation" period—a subject which he has more fully elaborated in the history of the German people—is doubly valuable; as a warning against the insidious influence of time-honored catch-words and parrot rhetoric, and as a help to an independent, intelligent study of the history of so-called Catholic state-craft in its

dealings with religion and the Church. And more especially in those high-schools and colleges where Fredet is still the text-book, would Janssen's vivid analysis of the great Cardinal Richelieu's policy aid in forming a juster estimation of the man and of history than was current among a goodly body of Catholics, outside of France, less than thirty years ago, and may be current still. Rightly does Janssen claim that the moving idea of Richelieu's life, to raise France to the rank of the first power in Europe—an idea to which he sacrificed the lives and happiness of millions—has not helped mankind forward in the attainment of its great aims, nor the French people in the attainment of their great aims. "Revolutionary in his methods, he unsettled all the guarantees of public right, and turned 'reasons of state' into 'principles of law.'" "The founder of that 'liberal' absolutism, which knows neither freedom nor law," "he used with devilish skill all the means which the Roman Republic looked upon as lawful in its dealings with other states," and speciously covered his lawless schemes with an embroidery of fine phrases: The re-establishment of German freedom; protection of friendly princes; free trade, and the national right of the peoples. To the Church, and that is to say to the deepest and best interests of the people, the policy of France for a hundred years before Richelieu's day did incalculable injury. The German princes could never have whipped their subjects into the new sects, were it not for the ready and powerful assistance of French intrigue, French money and French arms. But France was not only a powerful force in fastening Protestantism upon an unwilling people. Under Richelieu, she maliciously hindered the progress of the Catholic reaction, which promised to unite the people once more in religion, and to give them longed-for peace. The Swede, the Dane, the Italian, the Bohemian, the Hungarian, the unspeakable Turk, were by turns used as means to make division more certain. To the lasting injury of Frenchman and German, and indeed of mankind, success crowned Richelieu's ignoble efforts, and Protestantism was given a new lease of life. The traitorous, hypocritical, grasping princes ruled over a ruined, blasted, poverty-stricken land, whose bare fields reeked of good warm German blood. It was not the first time that "religions" were used to cover policies inspired by lust of "regions"; but if the people once learn to read the past aright, there will be an end of traditional policies, which rate the citizen's life and happiness of no account in comparison with vain ideas of national or personal glory, or with the gratification of personal spites. That a Cardinal Richelieu and a Cardinal Mazarin, men high in the Church's offices, should have stopped at no means to establish a hateful and hated despotism, is a sad fact in history: sadder still, that, while posing as the

protectors of the Church, they were actively undermining her power and influence. Not without reason does Janssen claim that their double crime moved the minds of men in opposition to the whole priestly order, to the Church, and Faith itself. This book is more than a masterly compendium of clearly stated facts, and a model of a popular historical sketch. Like all the author's works, it is a help to broad and original thought on the great moving questions of the past and present.

Seeking health and a wider experience of men, and at the same time intent on making a careful examination of the great manuscript collections, Janssen went to Italy in December, 1863. At Rome, he resided with Cardinal Reisach, whose friendship he had gained soon after coming to Frankfurt; and who not only held him in high esteem, but also gave him a large place in his affections. Pius IX. received the historian graciously, showed a particular interest in his work and conferred an especial honor on him by giving him permission to make free use of the Vatican Archives, then in charge of Theiner. The learned librarian had just published the fourth volume of the "Materials for the History of Poland," a work which excited the liveliest interest in Janssen, and led him on his return home in May, 1864, to make an original and thorough study of all the earlier and later documents and authorities which throw light on the division of Poland. The effects of this division were, to his mind, far-reaching; and they are active even to-day. "It made the Revolution an integral element in the new state organism." With more than ordinary zeal, therefore, did Janssen labor to provide the material for a just estimate of a memorable epoch. As the result of his studies, he published "The Genesis of the first division of Poland" (Freiburg, 1865); a work of primary importance to the student who would have a right understanding of the circumstances, and a correct measure of the persons connected with this fateful piece of politics.

Affection and admiration for Böhmer now prompted him to write a life of his friend and teacher, who had died October 22d, 1863. No one better knew, or could better appreciate, the great historian's character, work and aims; and no one could pay a higher tribute to friendship than Janssen did in "The Life, Letters, and Smaller Works of J. F. Böhmer" (3 vols., Freiburg, 1868). The "Life" was received with hearty praise, and at once took rank as a model biography of a learned man. So considerable was the interest it excited, that Janssen was led to publish a popular abridgment: "J. F. Böhmer's Life and Views" (Freiburg, 1869). In this octavo volume of three hundred and fifty pages, he skilfully traced the development of Böhmer's mind and heart and labors.

The book is one to be read of all men who would learn how to widen their own thought, and how to convey an honest estimate of another's mind and views; and no reader will lay it down without feeling that he has gained in breadth of patriotism, in love of learning, in admiration of study. Youth will learn from it how to study; and the historical inquirer, grounded in true principles and the methods of intelligent experience, will be spurred to better doing and greater diligence.

Neither these thoughtful, toilsome works, nor feeble health, nor the ministrations of his sacred office, nor uninterrupted historical studies, hindered Janssen from measuring and discussing our many-sided modern world, wherein old ideas are so active under new forms, and new men are so precipitate in doing and undoing old things. Between 1868 and 1876 he contributed a number of essays to the "*Historisch-Politische Blätter*," and to other periodicals, which were later on gathered together, and published under the title: "Pictures of Life, in Past and Present" (*Zeit und Lebensbilder*, Freiburg, 1876, 3d edition, 1879).

The rational ideas underlying the so-called Reformation of the sixteenth century were not new, but their material force gave them a body, and a form, and a centre of action which they had not had before. To trace the actual development of these ideas and their effect on modern civilization would be a mighty labor, but one surely helpful to the reflecting, and perchance to the unreflecting men, who, from sense of duty, or from ambition, or as hereditary rulers, seek to lead or govern mankind; and even more helpful to the masses who are so simply led or constrained. In the absence of a comprehensive work, every honest contribution to the study of particular periods, and of especial phases of thought and life, is valuable as an aid to the measure of the present and the future; to right thinking, and to right living. And for this reason these essays of Janssen deserve more than a passing word. Brimful of information and of thought, they give a suggestive sketch of somewhat more than half a century of a certain kind of German philosophy, science, religion, literature, morals and politics; and they are illustrated with faithful portraits of many of the clay idols that have been lifted up and worshipped on the altars of modern culture.

The influence of the men of the "*Aufklärung*," whose divinity was Goethe, has been, and still is, powerful not only in Germany and throughout the continent, but in England and America. The Emersons, like the Carlyles, are mere weak echoes of the more logically illogical minds that dominated Germany at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century; and our cultivated American society is thoroughly indoctrinated with the

unchristian and immoral teachings which, under a pleasing disguise of classic prose and verse, the master of form made so insidiously effective. To the not wholly corrupted mind no better corrective could be offered than Janssen's study of "A Woman of Culture, and her Friends." The cultured woman is Caroline Michaelis, who was born at Göttingen in 1763, her father being professor and *Geheimer Justizrath*, Johann David Michaelis. Though she feared she had lost her good name at fifteen, Caroline found a husband at twenty-one—a Dr. Böhmer. He died in 1788, but she lived what is sometimes called a merry life, until 1809. As the mistress or temporary wife of Johann Georg Forster, the traveller and naturalist, of August Wilhelm Schlegel, poet, critic and Sanskrit scholar, and of Friedrich Wilhelm Schelling, the philosopher, she enjoyed whatever advantages there could be derived from friendly association with all the noted men of the day. From the authentic story of her life, from her letters, and from the biographies and correspondence of contemporary heroes and heroines, Janssen has selected material for a lively sketch of society in the days when Goethe lorded it over women, men and princes—the days of free-love and art for art's sake; when Herder, Forster, Schelling, Schleiermacher, Alexander von Humboldt, Schiller and the two Schlegels, competed with each other in undermining Christianity, in panegyrizing paganism, in preaching the glory and the duty of revolution, in decrying nationality and patriotism, in prophesying the coming brotherhood of man, in abusing Catholicity, in glorifying nature, and in living loosely. The times were so out of joint that kings and princes and churchmen were eager to honor these worst enemies of the throne and the altar, and even to further their extremest doctrines. A prince-bishop, Von Erthal of Maintz, who was not too sure as to what he believed, not only gathered the leaders around him, and appointed them to offices of trust, but proved himself in somewhat a practical follower of their ideas. When Adam Weishaupt, the ex-Jesuit and professor of canon-law at Ingoldstadt, organized the Illuminati, he found ardent supporters not alone in Goethe, Herder, and Karl August of Weimar, but also in Von Dalberg, Bishop von Erthal's coadjutor. And yet the religion of the Illuminati was free-thinking, and the tenets of the order were distinctly opposed to the dogmas and the ritual of Christianity. With the coadjutor a Mason, as well as a Perfectibilist, as the Illuminati originally called themselves, it does not seem strange that the Canons of Maintz took down the crucifix from the walls of their rooms and set up Voltaire's bust in its stead; or that the writings of Helvetius and the treatises of the Illuminati replaced books of devotion and theology on their side-tables. In the Bavarian government the men of the "*Auf-*

klärung" had a firm friend. The Catholicity of Bavaria was to be liberalized; the "thick darkness" in which it was enveloped was to be dissolved; liberalized Bavaria was to become a centre of light for the whole of Germany. And to effect these great ends rationalists and doubters of all shades were gathered in from far and near, to fill the chairs of theology and philosophy. With the pulpit, the lecture-hall, the press and the stage united in the cause of "Humanity, Enlightenment, and purified Religion," there was every encouragement to thinkers of novelties, to destructive critics, to realistic or naturalistic poets and romancers, to pantheistic or atheistic teachers of a religion which was glossed and accepted as Christian. Schleiermacher, preacher at the "Charité" and at Trinity Church in Berlin, university preacher and professor of theology at Halle, and later at Berlin, a free lover, a man who looked upon marriage as an unnatural bond, and whose theology was as little Christian and as wholly personal as that of our own Beecher, was one of the most honored religious teachers of the day. His writings on "Religion" and on "The Christian Faith" were the guides of Evangelicals who wished to be up to the latest fashion of approved modern intelligent thought. It was a day for and of adventurers. Many a bitter or amusing page has been written on the Italian Humanists of the sixteenth century, and many a fine moral has been drawn from their lives and works. Janssen's study is suggestive of material much nearer at hand, quite as curious, and no less full of lessons for the modern man—which he who runs may read. Where the fine words of poet, philosopher and preacher are printed side by side with the record of their lives, the reality is painfully amusing when it is not shocking. Faithless in the animal relation they call love, treacherous in friendship, selfish to the utmost depth of egotism, vain, jealous, envious, restless, dissatisfied, flatterers, blasphemers, haters of God and men and themselves—thus they have carefully portrayed themselves with their own hands. The peculiarities of advanced German thought, its progress in this century, and the characteristics of a Godless science are emphasized in Janssen's essay on Alexander von Humboldt. At the celebration of von Humboldt's hundredth birthday, in Berlin (1869), one of the speakers proclaimed him "the incorporate ideal of a Saviour of Mankind," and still another boasted that "he had freed the human mind from every delusion concerning a so-called revealed religion." This latter statement may be prophetic, but for the present it is safe to qualify it as slightly exaggerated. The "Encyclopædic Cat"—as Minister Ancillon, a not too partial admirer, nicknamed the great naturalist—had the will, and did what he could; but there are powerful counter-forces to contend with, and faith in a revealed religion is

too scientifically rooted to be uprooted even by the writer of a "Cosmos." Von Humboldt's early affiliations with the "son of the gods," Goethe, with Schiller, with the Weimar and Jena cliques, and with all the men of advanced thought; his relations with Niebuhr, Bunsen, Stolberg, Tieck, Varnhagen von Ense, Cornelius, Von Reumont and Strauss; and his high position at the Prussian court, where he was long chamberlain and intimate of Frederick William IV., assured a plenty of evidence as to his character and ideals. This evidence witnesses to one great fact; that high intelligence, and power of concentrative thought, and desire for knowledge do not necessarily ennoble man. The world's heroes have one terrible enemy—their own letters. Von Humboldt's correspondence and the reminiscences of contemporaries, as Janssen here interweaves them, present a sad though instructive picture of a great deformed mind. Believing neither in God nor in the immortality of the soul, he necessarily despised Christian morality, religion in general, Catholicity in particular, and political order. The revolution is the logical outcome of atheism; as dynamitism, nihilism and anarchy are the logical conclusions of the scientific philosophy of the Von Humboldts. All the weaknesses of the men of enlightenment the "prince of German culture" developed in a high degree. Victor Strauss described him as "a monster of hate." Prince Bismarck in a pleasant way tells of his insufferable egotism; his own letters are the witnesses of his duplicity. There is no reader of Janssen's brief sketch, who retains a shred of Christian belief, but will be tempted to exclaim with Edmond Jörg: "May God preserve us all from such culture, and most of all the princes and the great ones of the earth."

To this type of the atheistic German scientist of the century Janssen adds a type of the atheistic philosopher, in the person of that highly gifted half-madman, Arthur Schopenhauer; and thus brings to a close his study of the irreligious schools. Now and again some well-intentioned youth is carried away by what he imagines to be a more rationally constructive or destructive system of philosophy than any into which he has thus far had a peep. Indeed, the method of the schools where ideas are dealt with quite independently of persons, may be in somewhat chargeable for these mishaps. If the light-minded were led first of all to know the character and the practical life of the pretended philosophers, he would have some surer check on his own wandering mind. No sane man will deliberately seek wisdom from a fool, or a knave, or a sensualist. It seems improbable that any serious mind, knowing even as much about the great "Nihilist" as Janssen tells of him, could go to Schopenhauer's pages in search of the secret of life. After tracing his somewhat romantic story

from the cradle to the grave, his vagaries, the growth of his ideas, the development of his unlovely character, and the sources of his speculations, Janssen completes the study of this unhappy pessimist by an analysis of his teachings and a sketch of some of the peculiarities of those other lights of modern philosophy, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel and Feuerbach. It has been the fashion to abuse St. Thomas and the schoolmen ; and they deserve abuse if these modern sophists are worthy of praise. Like the poets and preachers and scientists with whom we have just parted, they hate each other ; and their personal relations and mutual criticisms suggest a wholly new conception of the "philosophic mind." If possible, they are more egotistic than their unprofessionally philosophical brethren. Witness Hegel, who began his lectures on logic in the summer semester of 1820, with the words : "I might say with Christ: I teach the truth and am the truth." The others had not said this, but certainly it was not because their egotism was above blasphemy. As atheistic and as immoral as Von Humboldt or Goethe, and more irrational in some respects than either of them, Schopenhauer, who "had no need of Christ," assumed that "he had lifted more of the veil than any other mortal before him!" That anti-Christian, like reformed, culture should sneer at the "superstition" which canonizes the pure, the patient, the ascetic, is not to be wondered at, when the same culture finds its incorporate ideal of a Saviour of mankind in Von Humboldt, and divinities worthy of a temple in Feuerbach and Schopenhauer.

The healthy, elevating influence of religion on science and literature is strongly brought out in Janssen's essays on Karl Ritter, the founder of the science of comparative geography ; and on the Russian poet, Vasily Andrejevitsch Joukoffsky. Though educated in the school of Rousseau, Karl Ritter (1779-1859) felt the need and the worth of Christianity, and early turned away from the infidel thought by which he was encompassed. A life of patient, intelligent work, passed in the close study of nature and of men, was inspired by love for science directed to the honor of God. Contrasting his life and ideals with those of a Von Humboldt, the comparative pettiness of the ungodly scientist will force itself on all but the blind admirer. Like most non-Catholics of his and our time, Ritter had no true insight into Catholicity ; and hence many of the misconceptions which he began to imbibe at the breast are set down as facts in his writings. So simple and honest a character could not knowingly have told untruths. It is, indeed, to be regretted that prejudice should have so rooted falsehood in systems of education that the best intentioned men are innocently made to violate the truth they so much love. Besides the moral

lessons it conveys, this essay of Janssen's supplies many interesting facts about the progress of geographical science in Europe, and adds new details to the previous studies of German life at the beginning of the century. Ritter was a keen observer, with a wide experience of men; and from his letters much that is new may be learned about society in Frankfurt, Geneva, and Berlin, and about the standards of professors and students at the German universities.

Joukoffsky (1783-1852), the father of Russian romantic literature, leader of "Young Russia," patriot-poet, whose songs united a whole people, and who first gave Homer to the Russians in their own tongue, serves as fitting contrast to Goethe, or Schiller, or Voss. Deeply religious, filled with noble ideas about the true aim of poetry and the relation of art to morals, he was never untrue to his ideals. Constant in the endeavor to undo the work of the school of "art for art's sake," whose false notions have been so widely propagated among poets and people, he never tired of teaching that the aim of poetry was rightly to educate men, and not merely to please the imagination. The poet's motive, he maintained, should be sense of duty, not pay or fame. He gained both fame and honors. Maria Feodorowna called him to the court and appointed him instructor of the wife of the Grand Duke Nicholas, and of the young prince who, as Alexander II., the emancipator of the serfs, was to bear such strong testimony to the liberality of Joukoffsky's training. Neither life at court nor the flattery of the great altered his character or ambitions. "Faith, energy, patience"—in these he found the secret of a happy life. Just now the Russian novel is in fashion, and closely competes with the French article, whose filth makes it popular—to paraphrase Mr. George Saintsbury. The prophets of a school of false art, marked by a false realism and false sentiment, false morals, false politics and false religion, are Tourgénief, Dostoievsky, Tschernuiskevsky and Tolstoi, of whom a recent writer makes bold to say that "it would be hard to disprove that he had got closer to Christ's idea of life than any man since Christ's time!" A comparison of the work, lives, influence, and ideals of the new lights with those of the high-minded and Christian Joukoffsky, could only bring out in stronger relief his superior art, learning, merit, and genius. Literary men, young and old, may rather turn to him if they would seek a thoughtful, original, intelligent and ennobling companion or teacher.

In another group of studies on "Christian Carl Josias Bunsen;" "The Political and Ecclesiastical Views of the Prussian diplomats, Nagler and Rochow;" "Friedrich Christoph Dahlmann," and "The Political and Religious Views of Frederick William IV.," Janssen

surveys the field of German politics and the political leaders from 1820 to 1860, and thus affords an opportunity of measuring the effect of irreligious thought in literature, science, philosophy, and religion, upon government. Whether under democratic or monarchical forms, the people are the willing or unwilling tools of those whom fortune, revolution, or the meaner arts of men have lifted into office. Now-a-days, the man who has been made according to an official pattern in the State school or university is simple enough to imagine himself an exemplar of reason uncontrollable and free thought. In a higher civilization this would seem surprising; but it cannot surprise any one who considers the present civilization of continental Europe, where even the soldier slave has been educated into the idea that he is a freeman. To be the subject of a government in which a Bunsen (1791-1860) played a leading part was to deserve commiseration. By turns a student, a preacher, a teacher, an unsuccessful diplomat, a romantic statesman, his one ambition was to make his own way. A rattle-pate without religion, a great part of his life was spent in contriving pseudo-religious schemes, church reforms, creeds and rituals. Though he believed neither in Christ nor God, he was one of the leaders of evangelical thought, one of the founders of the "Evangelical Alliance," and a writer of prayer and hymn books. His idea of a church was that of a real Cæsaro-Papism; a political church under a Pope-King; a church controlled like the army and serving the same end—the security of the government. As great a prophet as Carlyle, he constructed a "Christianity," on whose adoption the future of religion depended. Pantheist, if anything, he was careful to qualify all his notions as Christian. He hated believing Protestants, for there were old Lutherans who opposed his teachings, and yet he was in one respect as Lutheran as Luther's self. Persistently, from the beginning to the end of his life he was an abusive hater of the Catholic Church. Whether in office or out of office, at home or abroad, he was ever active in attempts to injure "the old anti-Christ at Rome"; a real Pope-eater, with an insatiable appetite. The anti-Catholic machine is well oiled these days, and worked by skilful hands. An insight into its management fifty years ago may be of service to the unsuspecting. Bunsen's masters, Frederick William III. and IV., felt their obligations as heads of a church organization, and dabbled more or less in matters of conscience affecting their Catholic and Evangelical subjects. The two kings saw that there was something wrong with Protestantism; but if they knew what was amiss with it, they were careful to keep it to themselves. They saw the family life weakened, the Christian tenets losing their hold, immorality spreading, so they concluded that there ought to be a

return to apostolic forms, a bishopric at Jerusalem, and missions in California! Frederick William IV. had a lively conception of the necessity and power of religion and a serious acquaintance with Lutheran Christianity. About Catholicity he was worse than ignorant; he was filled with the traditional false notions concerning it. Of the helplessness and decay of Protestantism he was strongly sensible. He attributed the power of the Church to its unity; he dreamed of a united Protestantism; but he saw that he was powerless to effect anything among ten thousand sects, when he could not even unite the churches of his own domain. A better prophet than Bunsen, he foresaw that in the near future the Church would make even more rapid strides than in the past, especially in the East. "It is, indeed, God's ordinance," said he, "that truth should conquer in a beggar's clothes, but not in a fool's dress."

The politicians all felt the weakness of a divided Protestantism. Nagler, who held high office under the Prussian Government from 1824 to 1846, and who had no more religion than Bunsen, could not but lament that they were cut up into so many sects: "Lutherans, Reformed, Evangelicals, and all sorts of Pietists." But his regrets were only those of a hard-headed bureaucrat, whose whole life was haunted by the spook of Catholicity and those "devils," the Jesuits! Theodor von Rochow was not so easily frightened. He had studied the question more coolly, and came to the conclusion that "the Jesuits were less dangerous to Protestantism than its own theologians." Events have proved the correctness of his judgment as to the dangers Protestantism had to fear from its theologians; but we may better appreciate the grounds on which he based this judgment after reading "*The Recollections of David Strauss*," by William Nast, in the *New Princeton Review* for November, 1887. Mr. Nast was a fellow-pupil of Strauss, at Tübingen. The acceptance of the students in theology depended, he says, on mental proficiency, *without reference to moral or religious considerations*. In his class, Mr. Nast was "the only one who professed religion, in the sense of an experimental faith in the divinity and atonement of Christ." There was no spiritual instruction; and though the old and new Testaments were read in the original tongues, it was "not as the inspired word of God, not for edification and theological instruction, but as an exercise in linguistic criticism." The dangerous theologians of the eighteenth century had evidently made sure of worthy successors in the nineteenth; and, however dangerous the Jesuit may be to Protestantism, Rochow might well have greater fears of Baur and Schwegler, and Zeller, and Volkmar. As General in the Prussian army, and ambassador to Switzerland, Würtemberg and

St. Petersburg, Rochow, who was a man of much higher character and intelligence than Nagler, gained a larger view of men and of the contending currents of thought. His letters, written between 1830 and 1851, are full of facts concerning the growth of Radicalism on Swiss and German soil, the policy of Prussia towards its Catholic subjects, and the position of German Catholics towards their respective rulers. Rochow felt the necessity of political unity between Austria and Prussia in the interest of external and internal peace. On the other hand, Nagler, who wished to be in the front rank of the forwarders of modern culture, hated all governments other than his own, and all men other than himself; and dreamed only of undermining Austria. With this end in view, he kept in his employ a number of adventurers, paid to organize a system of agitation upon Austrian soil. It is interesting to compare the utilitarian methods of the Prussian politician of fifty years ago with those of the great Minister of to-day. The mighty Bismarck controls not Prussia alone, or the Empire, but Europe by means as far below those of an ideal civilization as were the expedients of the petty police-detective diplomat, Nagler.

It is a sad fact, but one which excited Friedrich Christoph Dahlmann's pride, that "the basis of the Prussian State rests on Martin Luther." The existing German Empire may be said to rest on the same uncertain foundation. Whatever their external show of force, both Prussia and the Empire are radically, necessarily, weak. The Lutheran principle is destructive, not constructive. Could we wholly exclude from our view the one saving factor, the Catholic Church, it would not be difficult to predict the Empire's future, the course of its politics, and the inevitable conditions of its civilization. Dahlmann's own experience presents a telling instance of the defectiveness of the Lutheran idea, and of its total inadequacy to satisfy the intellect of the reflecting man. Though brought up as a rationalist Protestant, the thoughtful study of history led him to recognize Christianity as the greatest gift of God to men. When he examined the tenets of Protestantism, its practical life, its preaching and worship, he found it wanting in every requirement of man's intellect and heart. He saw clearly enough that a church could not be built on the bare idea of Christian morality. In time the divine Christ, as he knew Him from the distorted Lutheran representation, ceased to satisfy his soul's aspirations. He sought relief in the company of the carpenter's son. The need of religion he felt deeply. Like Niebuhr, he could not find it in the sects; and, like him, he came to the conclusion that "we require a new religion." Dahlmann's ideas, opinions, work and failures serve to extend our view of a half century of German politics and civilization. An active student throughout

his life; widely informed by his experience as a pupil or a professor at Copenhagen, Halle, Kiel, and Göttingen; by his residence at Hanover, Leipzic, Jena, and Bonn; and by his studies on the historical development of European politics; an author of considerable works on European history, and a prominent actor in the "German Constitution" movement of 1848-49, he looked at politics from a higher plane than a Nagler or a Bunsen. He was a consistent antagonist of that monster tyrant, the modern State; opposed the systems of education which would deprive the parent of his natural rights, limit the freedom of education and enslave the soul; and protested against the State Church, and the current liberalism which, liberal only in words, oppressed the right, the individual, and society. How different would have been the story of the present Prussian Empire if its leaders had but learned the force of the truth that Dahlmann stated so well: "God's throne stands high above that of the king!" Not the least interesting portion of Janssen's essay on Dahlmann is that which treats of the historian-politician's relations with Frederick William IV., and of their dissenting views upon the question of a new German Empire. The idea of such an empire had long been working in the minds of German theorists, patriots, bigots and politicians. To Dahlmann the time seemed ripe for the realization of the idea. He approached the king, and by written and spoken word pressed him to allow himself to be named emperor. The argument presented to him was, that Prussia, the one purely German State with a definitely Protestant mission, should be the leader of a new German Empire, counteracting Austria, and exercising due power in the world. But the king, who knew something of German history, and had a strong sense of patriotism and of justice, as well as a keen appreciation of the dangers that must threaten a German Emperor who was not Emperor of Germany, declined to enter into the scheme. In the light of later political events Frederick William's moderate and sagacious views are doubly instructive. The title which seemed to him so vain his successor was pleased to accept, in the face of German tradition, if not of hereditary right. The great Minister's conception of the German Empire was less exacting, less logical, possibly less statesmanlike, than that of Frederick William, who valued words only as they rightly expressed real things.

The actual effects of Bismarck's policy on Prussia, the Empire and the rest of Europe, as well as the probable consequences of that policy, are ably discussed in Janssen's review of Gervinus's "Posthumous writings," which, on their publication in 1872, made such a stir in Germany. The author of the "History of the Nineteenth Century" was for more than thirty years an active maker

of public opinion on questions of German politics, through the daily press, the pamphlet, the more labored history, and in the professor's pulpit. In early life he would have been a poet if he could; in his new calling he showed that he was not wanting in imagination or power of fervid expression. His patriotism was always at white heat. The aim of all his work was to make Germans more German, and to raise their ideals up to his own. Like his friend Dahlmann, he had the courage of his opinions, and occasionally suffered for them. Though never a practical politician, he was long looked up to by conservatives as a leader and adviser, and there was no bolder or more honored champion of Prussia or of Protestantism. The Prussian, the Protestant, the patriot, who, in the light of the actual present, reads Gervinus's judgment on the development of events between 1866 and 1871, will be tempted to acknowledge that time has proved the keenness of his observation and his correct foresight—and, perchance, to doubt whether Frederick William IV. was not a wiser statesman and a truer lover of his country than the mighty Bismarck. The war with Austria—"a war of brothers"—was certainly not in the interest of German unity; on the contrary, it gave the death-blow to the Imperial idea, and definitely divided German from German. The so-called unification under the pseudo-empire meant in fact that free States had been deprived of their independence, and that the principle of federation, which formed the basis of the polity of the German State, had been overturned. Forgetful of its own history, Germany, moved by a mean spirit of imitation, had been a mere thoughtless follower in the footsteps of Italy. The fatal consequences of this policy moved Gervinus to grief and indignation. He saw a people, naturally intellectual, pressed out of the way of civilization, driven back into that of barbarism, and brutally made to serve the low interests of might and force. "A nation of civilizers had been transformed into a nation of soldiers; poets and thinkers into bullies and braggarts; idealism into greed of gain and the pursuit of enjoyments wholly material." To effect this retrogressive, this fatal policy, Bismarck had been compelled to ally himself with Radicalism, and thus had dealt another blow at civilization. The Democracy had been used as a mere temporary, serviceable instrument; but, using it, the government had put its seal upon it, confirmed its power for evil, and hastened the decomposition of the fermenting elements of society. It is more than fifteen years since Gervinus questioned whether the government would be able at will to undo its baneful work and bring health out of disease. Looking back at the events of fifteen years, and examining the immediate political conditions, we can see that time has not freed the State from its complication with the Revolution.

Bloody Democracy has been supplanted by bloody Anarchy, and the same statute-books that legalize socialism are crowded with laws for the suppression of the Socialist and his teachings. Have Gervinus's doubts been answered, or may we further question?

The world lies down at night fearing war, and rises still fearing. What else can the world expect? says the spirit of Gervinus. There stands Prussia, a permanent military power, frightful in her pre-eminence, surpassing the most extravagant of Napoleon's giant conceptions when he was master of the Continent. She is an ever-present hindrance to peace. Her's the reproach that Europe is one vast military camp, and that every European state was compelled by the war of 1866 to increase its army, transform its armaments, and burden itself with war expenditures. And her's, too, the reproach that the honest aspirations of mankind for liberty and peace have been smothered by this universal "Militarism." Will it be possible to revive these noble aspirations in that "new variety, or rather new kind of people and State," which military discipline is bound to develop?

Certainly, this indictment of "the one purely Protestant State with a purely Protestant mission," of the State "whose basis rests on Martin Luther," is still worthy the notice of thinkers, be they Protestant or not. Added years have not weakened its force. The abuses it decries have increased, not decreased; the dangers it foresees are not less pressing. That empire which promised peace to gain its end, now looks to war as its appointed mission; and a Von Moltke tells the representatives of the people that victory imposed upon the nation the duty of living fifty years in a condition of constant readiness for war. In the black night of the un-Lutheran tenth century, coming from some monk-ridden despot who could neither read nor write, this would have been a terrible speech. Is it the less terrible now that mankind have been freed in part from the tyranny of Rome—in part, from that of the Jesuits—and that Reason, and Enlightenment, and "Humanitarianism," and philosophy, and rational religion, and "Science," have full sway? And will these modern means of grace bring peace to the souls of the seven million Prussians who eke a living for themselves and their families out of a paltry thirty cents a day, waiting meantime the uncertain hour when they will be served up as food for powder? The events of the month of February, of this year of Our Lord 1888, have substantiated the truth of Von Moltke's cruel words. They but indicated a deliberate policy—compulsory only in as much as it was self-compelled. Bismarck, "the only man appointed by God to be His vicegerent on earth in these days"—according to the revelation granted the pre elected Carlyle—demands still more soldiers and still more taxes. Three-

quarters of a million of men have been added to the monster army in the interest of a peace which has not even the security of an armistice. By means which the incarnate Providence of Germany has not as yet suggested, seventy millions more of money are to be coined out of the brawn of the nation yearly, until sudden, bloody war compels the peace of exhaustion.

Oh, Civilization, what crimes are committed in thy name! A half-starved people, taxed, year by year, closer to starvation only that it may pay for its uniform and move like an automatic machine; an enslaved people, whose "ideals, education, consciences, depend on a ministry, and change with the minister"—such a people is a standing protest against the modern school of politics. There have been Americans who could not find words enough to glorify a system so radically opposed to ours; and this very fact may well suggest serious thoughts to those Americans who would not lose the rare and real liberties they now enjoy.

Janssen's pictures of our life and times attracted the general attention of thinkers and of literary men. They showed, not only a wide range of reading, but an intimate acquaintance with modern society, and a firm grasp of the problems of the age; and they proved the variety of his talents and the fertility of his mind. Always moderate in expression, he lacks neither courage nor force; and he has those rare gifts—a nice sense of form, and an agreeable style. The reader has already learned that he is endowed with two other great qualities—the love of work, and the power to work. Neither the essays, nor his laborious studies of the history of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, had satisfied his love or exhausted his power. He found still another subject worthy of his mind and pen, and gladly took it up in the interest of religion and the Fatherland.

If we recall the emotion with which the news of John Henry Newman's conversion was received throughout England, we may, perhaps, the more readily imagine the wave of excitement which passed over Germany when, in June, 1800, Count Friedrich Leopold von Stolberg laid down all his honors, at the age of fifty, and, with his family, returned to Mother-Church. A poet of taste and feeling, whose name had been closely associated with that of Klopstock, Goethe, and Voss, his ballads ranked with Schiller's and Bürger's, and many of his odes and hymns were cited as models.

The "Timoleon," "Theseus," "The Nursling," and "Apollo's Grove," had established his reputation as a dramatist of originality and power—the first who had succeeded in blending German thought with the classic forms of the Greek play. An accomplished classical scholar, his translation of the Iliad—the first version of a Greek poet in the metre of the original—gave him larger and deserved fame. A prose writer of rare quality, he had exer-

cised considerable influence on the thought of the time, concerning himself with a wide range of questions, political, religious, literary, and artistic. Having genius, he was none the less a practical man; and a good part of his life had been passed in administering government affairs, and in the diplomatic service. As ambassador at the courts of Denmark, Prussia, and Russia, he had not only gained a large experience of men, and insight into the current political movements, but he had commanded the respect and esteem of his associates, of the sovereigns whom he served, and of those to whom he was accredited. During the last nineteen years of his life, he used his learning and talents in the interest of the Church. By nature a singer of love and truth and beauty, his soul was filled with higher ideals than of old. Not content with moving the imagination of men, Stolberg sought to stem the flood of infidelity by an appeal to right reason and the realities of fact. He became a historian. Besides the "Life of Alfred the Great" (Münster, 1815), he published the "History of the Religion of Jesus Christ" (15 vols., Hamburg, 1806-1819), a work conceived on a large plan, and full of learning as of thought. More than one life of Stolberg had been written. In 1862, Menge published a lengthy and careful, though somewhat heavy study, entitled, "Count F. L. Stolberg and his Contemporaries" (2 vols., Gotha). Like the others, this was but the life of a dead man. No one had, thus far, revealed the real Stolberg to the world; the warm-hearted, honest-minded, deeply-religious Christian, whose soul burned with love for all good and hated all evil; the earnest patriot whose enthusiastic love of country was only equalled by his love of liberty, and whose love of liberty was limited only by respect for law; the dutiful husband and father, whose love of family was second only to that he had for God and the Church; the scholar who loved all learning, but loved it only as a means to inform and elevate mankind.

Janssen's work as a biographer had shown that he was gifted with rare powers of observation and analysis, and with a peculiarly sympathetic nature which readily merged itself in the personality of another. As pupil and tutor he had passed many happy days in the old Westphalian town of Münster, where Stolberg had lived the greater part of his new life, and where his name and fame were still fresh among the people. Everything pointed to Janssen as the fitting biographer of the brother-historian who had been animated by a spirit so like unto his own; and, though busied with exacting studies, he generously undertook the work. Stolberg's private papers were placed in his hands, and in 1876 he published the life of "Friedrich Leopold von Stolberg" (2 vols., Freiburg). The favor with which these volumes were received prompted him to prepare a new and smaller edition, on a modified plan, which,

sacrificing no important detail of the original, utilized new material so as to give a more complete view of Stolberg's character. This later volume shows Janssen's constructive skill at its best. We lose sight of the biographer and see and hear only Stolberg's self. He it is who lays bare for us his own manly, tender heart, and the aims and strivings of a noble soul. The story of his life and of the development of his mind is instructive and stimulating. As a member of the famed "*Hain*," an association which played an important part in the politico-literary history of Germany during the latter part of the eighteenth century, he had, in youth, been carried away by the false enthusiasms of his fellow-poets, and with them dreamed of liberty glorified by the revolution. Only a good Providence saved him from casting his lot with Goethe at the court of Weimar. A clear and strong intellect kept him Christian while the weak and restless minds around him fell into paganism, or so-called rationalism; and a burning love for freedom led him at length, after seven years of bitter struggle, into the Catholic Church; where, as he recognized—and where only—man is free indeed. He knew all the foremost men of the "*Aufklärung*," had seen into their minds and hearts, and watched and measured the effect of their work upon society; hence, his testimony as to their character, and the condition of society under the influence of their godless teachings, is particularly impressive. The reader of Janssen's essays on this period will gather from Stolberg new facts and ideas, helpful to a just estimate of a past whose false ideals control so large a part of mankind in the present. On the Church in Germany, as well as on Protestantism and atheism, Stolberg's conversion produced a remarkable effect. Protestants were for the moment stunned; still the man's ability and honesty were so well established that his action received more of regretful sympathy than abuse—though abuse was not wanting. His old friend, Voss—"the Christian poet"—pursued him bitterly to the very edge of the grave. In the atheist's eyes, he had betrayed liberty. Ministers of the gospel reasoned with him, and found him only too reasonable. Impressed by his acceptance of Catholic doctrine, many were led to inquire into the Church's teachings, and the conversions that followed, among the most intelligent laymen and churchmen, were numerous. The "*History of the Religion of Jesus Christ*" made a stir at the universities. Friedrich von Schlegel bore witness to the effect it produced at Heidelberg, and to the change wrought by its argument in the prevailing atheistic thought. He was not the only advanced thinker won over to the Church by Stolberg's presentation of the justice of her claims to lead mankind, and of the beauty and security of her teachings. German Catholics gained new courage in their trials, when they saw the loved and honored Stolberg return to the fold. They were moved to

greater activity ; and he was ready to help or to lead. Inspiring people and clergy, he sought, by word and example, to raise both one and the other to higher aims and nobler lives, in the interest of their country and their countrymen. Janssen's admirable book, giving new life to the great convert's words and works, is worthy the attention not of Germans only, or of students of history, but of men of every country who would be lifted out of the narrow circle of material thoughts which so confine the ideals and actions of young and old to-day.

In the same year in which the first edition of Stolberg's biography appeared (1876)—after twenty-five years of such rare training, and of so varied yet single-minded study, having utilized every published work and document of value, and a number of hitherto unprinted manuscripts, and having examined the archives of Frankfurt, Treves, Mainz, Lucerne, Zürich, Wertheim (not to mention other German "Sources"), and the Nunciature reports in the Vatican—Janssen issued the first half of the first volume of the "History of the German People." This volume was completed in 1878 ; the second appeared in 1879 ; and the third, fourth and fifth volumes have since been sent to press, as health allowed. If we knew nothing of the man, his education, powers or purpose, the list of the thirteen hundred and fifty manuscripts and printed works he has consulted would suffice to assure us of the broad and solid foundation on which he has builded. The use made of the material at command testifies not only to its extent, but to its value in helping unprejudiced inquirers fully to understand the deformation which some uninstructed writers still qualify as a "Reformation." Janssen is no polemist, neither defender nor opponent of individual, party or sect. Without passion, without one word of criticism, with no single expression of personal opinion, he records the facts ; facts substantiated by credible witnesses and stated in their own words. Every page supports his simple statement of the purpose of his work, as given in the preface to the sixth edition of the first volume : "My endeavor is plainly to expose the truth of history, as well as I can gather it from the original authorities ; from any other 'tendency' whatever I know myself to be free." The success of this endeavor and the force of plain truth have been practically illustrated by the effect of Janssen's history upon non-Catholics. Through reading it many have been brought back to the Mother-Church ; and no less than fifty Protestants, including ministers and teachers in public institutions, sent congratulatory letters to the author on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his ordination.

Among those who cannot believe the truth, because it is so new, Janssen has spread consternation. Other weapons failing, the standard dictionary of bad language has been greatly enlarged and flung

full at his head. "The enemy is under our walls. The Reformation is once more about to enter on a deadly struggle with Rome. Gird up your loins and stand as one man. *The Lord fill you with hate against the Pope!*" Such is the appeal of one Martin Rode, a theologian, of course. Professor Hans Delbrück, of Berlin, not satisfied with associating Janssen with the "Prince of Darkness," and Judas, denounces him as a "coiner," and wants to have *his ears cut off!* In America the Lutheran *Familienblatt* and the St. Louis *Abendschule* have been quite as scientifically critical. Professor Walther, of St. Louis, having probably run out of epithets, republished some of Cranach's wood-cuts, ridiculing the Papacy, with the original Luther-text—certainly a powerful answer, though inordinately abridged, to Janssen's five volumes of solid text, without illustrations. The *Evangelical Church Advertiser*, of Berlin, wants some one "to draw out of its scabbard the sword of the heroic age of reform and hit the insolent enemy on the head with it;" and some one else to inflame "the holy Protestant scorn of apocalyptic Rome." The *Advertiser* proudly announces that a number of learned Germans have at length founded a "Reformation" History Society, in Magdeburg—ominous name! Indeed, a cry has gone up for an Anti-Janssen; a history written in the Protestant sense, and which shall at the same time undo Janssen's work. How useless such a pseudo-history would be now, how unimpregnable is the simple, though novel, method of massing fixed fact on fact, of letting men speak for themselves and of the scenes in which they played a part, Janssen has made clear in his two admirable little volumes addressed "To My Critics" (Freiburg, 1882–1883). Models of polite, incisive controversy, they are the most unanswerable refutations of the ill-provided critics, who had learned to look upon their text-books as a part of the Gospel, and they are an equally complete defence of the facts by the facts. He himself had made his task easy.¹

Catholics may be proud of having given to England a John Lingard, and to Italy a Cesare Cantù. Giving to Germany a Johannes Janssen they have no less reason to be proud. But not content with pointing to the works of these great men, they should be moved by a noble ambition to do like service in like ways. The

¹ The following extract from a long, and on the whole fair review of Janssen's History, by M. Paul Bourdeau, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, April, 1888, is worth quoting: "In fact, it is much easier to get angry with M. Janssen, and even to abuse him, than it is to refute him. It will not do to put up against him M. von Ranke, a rather vague historian, who excels in unravelling diplomatic affairs, in pointing out the movement of opinions, in drawing historical portraits, but who never gets down among the masses. All this history would have to be made over again, with the immense labor, and the realistic exactitude which M. Janssen has consecrated to it." —When the folks who think they are reformed have reformed their history-books, they will have taken the first practical step in the way of intelligent, honest reform. Reformer, reform thyself!

aim of the true scholar is not personal. Seeking not fleeting fame or uncertain honors, his strivings are directed by the love of truth and the hope that he may become the intellectual father of a progeny of truth-lovers. Still, the true scholar deserves to be honored in his lifetime; and Janssen has received worthy recognition at the hands of Catholics. Würzburg conferred upon him the degree of Doctor in Theology, Louvain that of Doctor of Laws; the Archbishop of Freiburg appointed him one of his councillors, and our sympathetic Pope, Leo XIII., who has spoken such moving words to students of history, raised the historian to the offices of Prelate and Apostolic Prothonotary. But his greatest, most lasting honor is his masterly history.

BUDDHISM AND CHRISTIANITY COMPARED.

Problèmes et Conclusions de l'Histoire des Religions, par l'Abbé de Broglie, Professeur d'Apologétique à l'Institut Catholique de Paris. Paris, 1885.

Le Dictionnaire Théologique de Bergier, Approprié au Mouvement Intellectuel de la Seconde Moitié du XIXe Siècle, par l'Abbé Le Noir; article *Bouddhisme*. Paris, 1876.

OF all the religions now or ever professed by men, only three are universalist, that is, calculated by principle and by dogma to be received not merely by a portion, but by all of mankind. These religions are Christianity, Islamism, and Buddhism. This fact alone would render a comparative study of these systems an interesting and profitable one. But Christianity and Buddhism present, in their origin, history and teaching, so many points of resemblance; they both, though in a different degree, so far excel all other systems in the tone of their morality, that a special comparison between them is almost forced on the attention of all who are interested in the great problems which every religion claims to be able to solve. It is strange that, until a comparatively recent date, so little should have been known concerning a religion professed, according to the most moderate of trustworthy estimates, by two hundred and fifty millions of beings, and dating from at least the sixth century before our era. Of course, even in the Middle Ages the Lamaism of Thibet, the Fo-ism of China, and the

Buddhism of Ceylon, had been described by Catholic missionaries; but no one seems to have surmised the unity of these systems, or to have apprehended the real nature of their morality, before the year 1820, when an English governor of Ceylon and an English resident in Nepaul almost simultaneously gave to the scientific world two collections of Buddhist sacred books, one in Sanskrit, and one in Pali. About the same time, a famous Hungarian orientalist, Csoma de Koros, found in a Thibetan monastery a similar collection which was, for the greater part, a translation from the Hindoo books. In later days translations of the same works have been found in the Mongolian, Chinese, and Japanese languages. With the discovery of these books there arose on the part of many, an exaggerated admiration for the beauties of Buddhism, and the atheistic world gleefully acclaimed the supposed fact of entire nations contradicting the testimony of the human conscience in favor of the existence of a Supreme Being. Referring to this unmeasured enthusiasm for Buddhism, the Abbé de Broglie remarks: "If this religion was so beautiful, so ideal, and nevertheless so contrary to the general sentiments of humanity, how happened it that, until its sacred books were unshelved, such curious and striking characteristics were unknown? If Buddhism was really so different from the gross polytheism with which missionaries and travellers had confounded it, how did the mistake originate? There are only two ways of explaining this anomaly. Either we must suppose that modern Buddhism has so degenerated, that it in no way resembles the system inculcated in its sacred books, or we must admit that in practice it never accorded with its theoretic doctrine. In either case, the importance of Buddhism is much lessened, and so also is the gravity of the atheistic objections drawn from it."

The legendary and the real Buddha are so confused, that a satisfactory separation is nearly impossible. The life of Sakya Muni is known to us only by means of biographies written many centuries after his death; and much of it is not only legendary, but mythological. Senart demonstrates the existence of solar myths in this legendary life; of myths similar to those found in the story of Krishna, and analogous to the Greek fantasies concerning Hercules.¹ Some authors assign the birth of the Indian reformer to the eighth century B.C.; but De Broglie, following the chronology of Eugene Burnouf, Neve, and Pillon, certainly the most untiring of investigators in this matter, gives the year 557 B.C. as the date. His proper name was Siddhartha, his family name Sakya, and he came of the royal race of the Gautama, sovereigns in central India.

¹ *Essai sur la Légende de Bouddha.*

The title of Muni, or "solitary," was affixed to his name after he entered on the ascetic life. The title of "Buddha," which in Sanskrit signifies "one who has attained to perfect knowledge, *Bodhi*," was assumed by himself; and it must be remembered that this title was not personal to Sakyā Muni, for he bore it in his quality of universal doctor, and in the Buddhist doctrine there are many Buddhas. Strictly speaking, therefore, we should not talk of "Buddha"; we may say "a Buddha," or at most "the Buddha."¹ In China, the name Buddha became Fo, which signifies, according to the Chinese encyclopedist, Ma-Touan-Lin, "pure intelligence," "absolute knowledge." In Siam, a Buddha is known as Phot; and in Japan he is called Chaca or Xaca. Following the "Lotus of the Good Law," a Buddhist *sutra* (discourse of Buddha) translated into French by Burnouf, we shall give a succinct narrative of Sakyā's career. A wife of king Suddhodana, by name Maya or Mayadevi ("illusion"—a name assigned to her because of her ravishing beauty), while still a virgin, gave birth to the new religionist, and died seven days afterward, that she might not be pained by her son's sufferings as a mendicant monk. Before his birth from Maya, the new Buddha had passed through five hundred and fifty existences; he had been an ascetic, a brahmin, a merchant, a king, a parrot, a lion, a monkey, etc. But at his last birth, he immediately took four steps toward the four cardinal points, and cried: "I shall never be born again. I am the greatest of beings." His childhood was passed in study and meditation, and while yet a mere boy his tutors could teach him nothing. Happily married to a worthy girl, and surrounded by a harem of 80,000 others, Siddhartha was always occupied in serious thoughts, of which the following are samples: "All these worlds—that of the gods, that of the Asuras, and that of mankind—are afflicted by disease, by the miseries of old age, and by the fire of death. Like a mountain torrent, life runs with irresistible swiftness. By the facts

¹ Certain sanctuaries possess relics of Buddhas who were anterior to Sakyā Muni. These Buddhas came at unequal intervals, the later ones having a duration of 2000 or 3000 years. The next Buddha, called Maytreya, is now in the heaven of Toocita, and he will descend 5000 years after the *Nirvana* of the present one. In the Buddhist books a Buddha is often variously designated. A *Tathagata* is one who has run his religious course, after the manner of preceding Buddhas. The title of *Baghavat* or "Happy One" is given not only to a Buddha, but to him who is about to become one. *Bodhisattva* signifies "one who has the essence of *Bodhi* or omniscience"; a *Bodhisattva* is an incipient Buddha, and a Buddha is a perfected *Bodhisattva*. To become a Buddha, a *Bodhisattva* must apply his intelligence to the salvation of men. *Arhat* means "venerable," and the Buddhist monks of a superior grade are so called. When given to a Buddha, this title signifies "the venerable one of the age."

of existence, of desire, and of ignorance, all creatures, whether in the home of the gods or in that of men, are subject to the three evils. Desire, always accompanied by fear and misery, is a source of grief. Every composite thing is perishable; it is by turns effect and cause; every being comes from another, and hence the apparent perpetuity of substance. But the wise man is not deceived; he perceives that every composite, every aggregate, is merely a void. Everything revealed by our senses is a void, within and without." Under the influence of such reflections, Siddhartha, at the age of twenty-nine, took to the woods, and commenced an ascetic life. Now and then he frequented the Brahmanic schools, but they did not show him "the way which leads to indifference for things of earth, to freedom from passion, to the *Nirvana*." That he might find this way, he retired from human society for six years, and at last, having conquered the temptations of the demon Mara, he went to a place called Bodhimanda, "the seat of knowledge," and seating himself under the fig-tree where preceding Buddhas had rested, he vowed that he would not arise until he had acquired supreme knowledge. After he had spent a day and a night without any movement, he found the "absolute," and was a perfect Buddha. The great heart of Sakya Muni would not allow him to reserve the possession of truth to himself: "Whether or not I teach the law, it will not be learned by those who now are involved in error; they will know it, who are following the truth; but as for those who are in doubt, they will embrace it if I teach it, and if I do not, they will never know it." Therefore pity for the doubting decided the mission of the new Buddha, and he resolved to inculcate the "four sublime truths"—grief, its cause, its destruction, and the *Nirvana*—all of which were connected with the then dominant doctrine of the transmigration of souls. "My law," said he, "is a law of grace for all;" for kings and subjects, for brahmins and the ignorant, for friends and strangers, for men and—with some modifications—for women. A unity of duties must ignore all Brahmanic prescriptions of caste; there must be no barriers of class, race, or nation. And although the new law subverted the very foundations of Brahmanic power, its simplicity—so different from the difficulties met by the student of the Vedas—attracted many of the brahmins, as well as many kings and princes who were glad to escape from the yoke of a tyrannous priesthood. But it was among the lower classes that Sakya Muni had the most pronounced success, for they regarded him as their liberator. He suffered some persecutions, but he died a natural death, and one which gave the brahmins an opportunity of charging him with gluttony. One of his disciples brought him a large mess of pork and rice, and a fatal attack of indigestion ensued—a

very prosaic exit for a Buddha. Sakya Muni is now in the *Nirvana*, and is the object of a certain kind of love on the part of Buddhists. But this love is very different from that which Christians feel for Jesus. The Christian's love for his Saviour is an efficacious sentiment, and it manifests itself in sacrifice; but no Buddhist would dream of any act of renunciation for the Buddha's sake. And why should he? Even before his death, Sakya had attained to the *Nirvana* of the passions, to an absence of all feeling; and now, if not annihilated, as many hold, he is in the very "perfection" of indifference toward everything in the universe.

Sakya Muni left no writings, but his discourses were collected by his disciples and afterwards rearranged by various Buddhist councils. Immediately after the reformer's death, a council of five hundred members assigned this task to his three most illustrious followers, Ananda, Kasyapa and Upali; a hundred and ten years afterward, in the reign of the famous Asoka Pyiadasi, whose inscriptions are yet preserved for the instruction of orientalists, another council revised the work; and four hundred years after Sakya's death, a third council definitively determined the canon of the Buddhist scriptures, which consist of *Sutras*, or discourses of the Buddha, of the *Vinaya*, or books of discipline, and of *Adhidharma*, or metaphysical theories. According to De Broglie, who follows the opinion of Eugene Burnouf,¹ Pillon,² Albrecht Weber,³ Hardy,⁴ Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire,⁵ and of many other grave authorities, Buddhism admits no first, fixed and absolute cause in the origin of things: "The prime characteristic of this doctrine is atheism, or, to speak more precisely, an absence of the idea of God. Buddha cares not to know whether there be a first cause; such a question is, for him, a superfluous and insoluble problem. As to this matter, he is in a state of mind like that of those who are called positivists in France and agnostics in England. Hence there is no prayer, no gratitude towards a Supreme Being, no mission from on high, for Sakya. All that he is, he is of himself; and he has acquired it in previous existences. We find no trace of any idea of grace, of divine help, in his doctrine. He does not pretend to be a god, or even an envoy from heaven. He is a man, a sage, and all his knowledge is the result of his own efforts. In his own opinion, Sakya is the first of beings, acknowledging no superior." De Broglie, therefore, and all the orientalists who call Sakya Muni an atheist, would have us believe that two hundred and fifty millions of Asiatics—the most spiritualistic minds on

¹ *Introduction à l'Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien*, 1845.

² *L'Année Philosophique*, 2me Année, 1868.

³ *Indian Studies—German Review*, October, 1858.

⁴ *Manual of Buddhism*, 1850.

⁵ *Bouddhisme, 1855—Le Bouddha et sa Religion*, 1859.

earth—were led away from a theistic doctrine by a promise of poverty and mortification in this life, and of nothingness—not an absorption into Brahma, but absolute nothingness—in the future. Such a supposition is not acceptable to the Abbé Le Noir, one of the best polemicists of our day. Had the very valuable work of De Broglie appeared before Le Noir prepared his article on Buddhism, the latter author would certainly have tendered it that courteous but uncompromising consideration which he ever manifests toward those from whom he feels obliged to differ. However, De Broglie may find the refutation of his theory already developed in Le Noir's thoughtful pages. In the first place, Le Noir asks Eugene Burnouf, who was the first to charge Sakya Muni with a denial of God and an annihilation of the soul, on what is this accusation based? Not on the discourses of the Indian reformer, for Burnouf admits that they do not furnish one word in proof of the allegation. And it is certain, insists Le Noir, that brave as Sakya was, he never attempted to interfere with the dogmas of Brahmanism: "If he did not accept the ancient creed of Brahmanism, why did he not attack it? Why did he content himself with a contradiction of the Brahmanic moral system, and utter no word in denial of Brahmanic dogma?" And the adepts of Sakya Muni followed the same course. Had the Buddha found fault with Brahmanic theology, the second Buddhist council, which degraded ten thousand priests on account of heresy, and the third, which degraded sixty thousand for the same cause, would have warned the faithful against that theology. Again, not one Brahmanic work can be cited as condemnatory of any heresy in Sakya's reformation of the ancient system. During the first years of Buddhism, the Brahmins did not disturb its followers. It was only when the pampered priests of Brahma realized that Sakya's notions of future equality and fraternity menaced the social fabric of which they were the head, that they determinedly confronted the new doctrine. Many Brahmanic priests entered the Buddhist priesthood, for Sakya had not abolished the priesthood any more than he had abolished sacrifice—other than that of animals. Finally, the Buddhist scriptures are profoundly theistic. In the *Guna-Karanda-Vyuka* we read: "When no other being as yet existed, Sambhu, who exists of himself, was; and as he preceded all other beings, he is called Adi-Buddha. He wished to be no longer the sole being, and therefore he multiplied himself." *A-se-itās* is plainly indicated in this passage, as well as the unity of a first cause and an explanation of creation.¹

¹ While De Broglie contends that Buddhism is atheistic "in the sense that it does not admit a Supreme Being," he avows that "it is polytheistic, inasmuch as it accords divine honors to the Buddhas and the Bodisattvas. And it must be noted that the Buddha's doctrine does not exclude that polytheism which was older than itself. It

A fundamental doctrine of Sakya Muni was that of metempsychosis, or the transmigration of souls—a doctrine taught not only by the Brahmins, but by Empedocles, Pythagoras and Plato, by many of the ancient Egyptian philosophers, and probably held by the Jewish Pharisees and the more modern Cabalists. According to both Brahmanism and Buddhism, this transmigration is effected not only from one human body to another, but to the body of a brute, or even to a plant. A fatal and inexorable law compels all beings to a new birth, again and again, that they may expiate the faults committed in their previous existences. The Buddha did not make this law; he cannot interfere with it. But Sakya Muni was privileged to understand this law better than any other human being, and to show men how they could be freed from suffering. According to him, and, to a certain extent, according to Brahmanism, every existence is an evil; even the life of the demi-gods, who inhabit the heavens, is an evil. And why is existence an evil? Because it must terminate. Happiness ensues only after deliverance from existence, and that deliverance is the *Nirvana*—the most obscure, as it is the most important, point of Sakya's doctrine.

What is the *Nirvana*? The Buddha does not tell us. Buddhist philosophers represent it under the figure of a lamp which gives no light, because of want of oil. It is certain that the Buddhist scriptures, if not all Buddhist hearts, dwelling more on the evil than on the bright side of life, are filled with a passionate hatred for all mundane existence. When, under the fig-tree, Sakya attained sovereign wisdom, he cried: "Principle of human life, constructor of this tabernacle of the human body, I have sought thee during my many existences. It is a terrible thing to be ever reborn. Now I have found thee, and I have conquered thee. Thy chains are broken, and thou canst not cause me to be born again."¹ And when dying, the reformer insisted that every changeable thing is destined to destruction, and he urged his disciples to therefore "struggle bravely"; that is, he taught that men cannot escape that universal law of death which is above gods and men, but they

preserves, under the style of *devas*, the gods of the Indian Pantheon. Brahma has multiplied himself, and is replaced by a number of beings having the same name, whose chief is the Great Brahma, *Maha-Brahma*. And in addition to these gods, we find a hierarchy of supernatural beings, good and evil, angels and demons, having forms of birds or of serpents, and living on earth, in the air, or in the ocean. All these beings, even the greatest, are inferior to the Buddha; they form his court, hearken to him, and are converted to his doctrine. Some have not yet entered on the road to perfection; some become *arhats*; some arrive at once at the *Nirvana*. Their position as inferiors to the Buddha does not deprive them of their natural power, and men may worship them and invoke them."

¹ Dhammapada, ch. XI. (Collection of Max Muller, Sacred Books of the East).

can escape, by virtue, that other law according to which death must be followed by another birth. What, then, is this *Nirvana* which Buddhism promises as man's recompense hereafter, and on which it erects its moral edifice here below? Those who regard pure Buddhism as atheistic, tell us that the *Nirvana* is absolute nothingness. They derive the word from *nir*, a euphonic form of the negative particle *nis*, and *va*, "a breath," and insist that its meaning is "extinction." But cannot the *Nirvana* be an absolute, simple and permanent existence, ending the painful and indefinite metempsychosis? Can it not be, as Obry, Foucaux and Colebrooke interpret it, very similar to that eternal repose which the Catholic Church begs for her children in her funeral prayers? *Nirvana*, contends Le Noir, is not, as Pillon asserts, an almost meaningless word. *Nir* is the negative particle; *va* means "a wind," and therefore the term signifies "no wind," or an absence of tempest—in fine, a calm. Calm is not annihilation. The *Nirvana* is something. It is a deliverance from torment; it is a non-torment, which implies a comparison with the preceding torment, and is therefore a joy, and is experienced by a conscious being. Perhaps the meaning of this term may be illustrated by a consideration of the words sometimes used by nearly all sects of Indian origin when they wish to indicate man's final happiness. According to Colebrooke, nearly all those sects, Buddhism included, use the term *mukti* or *moksha*, with some differences of interpretation, such as emancipation, deliverance from evil, a riddance of earthly things, exemption from subsequent transmigration, etc. There are certain synonyms of *mukti*, e.g., *apavargya*, completion; *niksreyasa*, perfection; *kaivalya*, solitude; *ananda*, imperturbable apathy; none of which imply annihilation. We are led, therefore, to believe that a discontinuance of individuality is not a condition of entrance into the *Nirvana*, and that this state is one of incessant apathy. And how can one be happy unless he *is*? "A child," says Le Noir, "would not be guilty of such a contradiction, and we are told that Sakya Muni, who was one of the greatest geniuses who ever exercised a religious influence in the world, fell into it; and that after his death, two hundred and fifty millions did the same. If primitive Buddhism was what our positivists say it was, if Sakya Muni taught an atheistic doctrine which assigned nothingness as the only hope of man, how is it that we find a precisely contrary doctrine professed by all the Buddhists of our day, who cherish all the superstitions naturally following a teaching which has God and the soul's immortality for a basis, when it is not upheld by a force more powerful than man's passionate nature? Certainly the average Buddhist of our time has no conception of a *Nirvana* such as the positivists imagine. His future abode is in one of the many

heavens placed one over the other, in which he will live for ages in the enjoyment of both intellectual and sensual pleasure.

Touching the moral doctrine of Buddhism, we must first observe that the mendicant monk, the *Bhikkus*, was the principal object of Sakyas' prescriptions, for the monk alone can become an *arhat*, that is, he alone can arrive at the perfection which leads to the *Nirvana*. In reality, the monkish assembly is the Buddhist church. In Christianity the ascetic life is an exception; in Buddhism monasticism is the rule. The Buddhist religious is vowed to celibacy, and his perseverance is aided by public opinion, which, in all Buddhist countries, is very severe on this point. Like our friars, the Buddhist monk can possess nothing; he lives on alms. But in one matter the Buddhist religious differs from the Catholic monk, especially from the ideal of that monk, as conceived and concretized by St. Benedict. The Buddhist monk does not work. No Buddhist Montalembert would ever find, among the ascetics of his religion, material for such a glorification of the monastic system as the French publicist gave us in his "Monks of the West." The Buddhist religious passes his life in meditating on the nothingness of the world; that is, in a species of laziness. The monks, however, do not form the totality of the Buddhist community. The hearers, or *Upasakas*, receive precepts of pure morality, such as not to steal, not to commit adultery, not to drink intoxicating beverages, not to kill any animal. The last prescription, founded on the doctrine of metempsychosis, is not observed to the letter, but it has produced a state of things in all Buddhist lands which would encourage the late Mr. Bergh. The principal duty of the *Upasaka* is to support the monk and nun; but no matter how well he fulfils it, he never can become an *arhat*. Nevertheless, after a number of new existences, the masculine *Upasaka* may enter the *Nirvana*; as for the women, not even nuns can attain this happiness, until they have gone through at least one more life in the masculine sex. As to the positive side of Buddhist morality, what we call charity, there would seem to be little of it, for the Buddhist appears, at first sight, to be profoundly egotistic, desiring even the *Nirvana* only as a means of escape from suffering. However, the system proposes the good of our fellows as a motive of action, and Saky Muni set the example. He had been an *arhat* during many centuries, and could have entered the *Nirvana* long before he did enter it; but he preferred to go through many painful existences, in order to enlighten mankind. This charity, however, is very different from that of Christianity. "The language of Buddhism," says Oldenberg, "has no word to express the poetry of Christian love, of that charity described by St. Paul. The realities in which that poetry has been actuated in the Christian world,

have no counterpart in the world of Buddhism." This system produces no hospitals (unless for animals), no orphanages, etc.; the only alms inculcated is that given to the monks.

Coming now to the principal object of our article, it must be admitted that there are striking resemblances between Buddhism and Christianity. Probably, popular Buddhism has been affected by the missionaries of Nestorianism, which, from the very days of its founder, has exercised an active, though not very successful propaganda in the East. "There is, indeed," remarks De Broglie, "a Chinese Buddhist ritual, which seems to have been copied from an Oriental Christian liturgy. Modern atheists insist much on the similarities which they find, and on others which they fancy they discover, in the principal religions. They tell us that Christianity cannot be of Divine origin, for a Divine religion must be entirely different from all others. In Buddhism, as well as in Christianity, we find the idea of a universal religion, and that of a Redeemer of men. In the Buddhist scriptures we read of a counterpart of the penitent Magdalen, in the person of the courtesan converted by Upagupta. The touching conversation between Jesus and the Samaritan woman is reproduced in an interview between Ananda, the favorite disciple of Sakyā, and a woman of the despised caste of the Chandalas. Like Jesus, the founder of Buddhism retires to the desert, and there suffers the assaults of the demon. The Buddhists practise confession, and Holy Communion is represented by a participation in the sacrificial victims. From these and many other resemblances agnostics deduce, to their own apparent satisfaction, an equal value and authority for Buddhism and Christianity. But is it true that the true religion must differ entirely from all religions of human origin? As well ask, whether there can be, and are, any similarities between the lives of civilized men and those of barbarians? Heresy may exaggerate the effects of the fall of Adam, and may teach that man's nature is so deeply vitiated as to be capable of no moral good. It may insist that, outside of the household of faith, every action is a sin; that, outside of the true Church, there is no grace; and that God gives means of salvation only to a limited number of predestined souls. It may, therefore, be incapable of understanding how paganism can produce a Marcus Aurelius or a Sakyā Muni. But Catholic theology distinguishes the natural from the supernatural order, and it admits that natural good may exist among pagans, for it holds, with St. Paul, that even these unfortunates have the law of God engraved in their hearts. Every man, without faith, can discern good from evil, can believe in future retribution, and can try to conquer his passions. Nay, more; he may attain even to the supernatural good, for God wishes all men to be saved, and His grace may be

distributed to all men of good will through channels unknown to us. No wonder, then, that there is a certain resemblance between Christianity and some other religions. All religions are institutions destined, some in a lesser and some in a greater degree, to satisfy certain instincts of human nature. A religion produced by a Divine cause, and another derived from a human one, must necessarily, by the very fact of their being religions, present certain similarities; just as all buildings, whether palaces or huts, destined for the shelter of men, must be somewhat alike. When men are deprived of the benefit of Divine revelation, what happens? They seek what they need, and, if necessary, in their own imaginations. If a self-styled prophet appears, many care not to examine his credentials, and regarding only their own aspirations, they gladly hearken to his theory of salvation. Then their own emotional nature leads them to establish a ritual. New messiahs, mahdis and prophets are never wanting, and the nineteenth century has welcomed as many as any other. Thus are developed false religions in which all is not imposture; in which there necessarily is some truth. And when God decrees to satisfy the yearnings of the human heart, to reveal Himself to men, to show them the road to heaven, He does in a perfect manner what the impostor pretended to do. He establishes, either directly or by means of His accredited agents, a ritual and other religious institutions; and He satisfies, by real miracles, the instinct for the supernatural which is, and ever has been, manifested by the human race. It is evident, therefore, that there must be much similarity between the true and all false religions. Nevertheless, the hand of God will always be visible in the true religion.

Compare the life of Jesus Christ with that of Sakya Muni. When we investigate the real lives of the world's great men, when we pass from the poetry of fiction to the prose of history, we discover, in every case, a very great difference between the real man and the ideal personage. Indeed, in many instances, history can tell us but little about the real man; thus, we know few of the details of the life of Sakya Muni, and, as to his discourses, all Orientalists agree that they are of dubious authenticity. But concerning Jesus Christ, we have a full historic reality, and that reality is in just accord with the ideal. As to Sakya Muni, if we may trust the Singhalese books, which above all others exalt his virtues, we find the ideal very different from the real Buddha. Take, for instance, the following narrative, furnished by Hardy, in his "Manual of Buddhism." One day, while Sakya was meditating in a garden, five hundred monks came to interview him, and when they were invited to seat themselves and await his leisure, they made so much noise when placing their begging-pots on the

ground, that Sakya cried out to Ananda: "Who are these who make as much of a racket as fishermen would when drawing their nets?" When Ananda informed him, he ordered the visitors to be ejected, with an injunction never again to show themselves where he might be, and it required an express intervention of Brahma to appease his ire. Can even an agnostic fancy Jesus Christ acting in this manner? No; the life of Jesus, as narrated in the Gospel, is an ideal life, even though agnostics may not acknowledge it as a superhuman one. And this ideal cannot be the work of human imagination, exercising itself on a gross and inferior reality. It requires no acquaintance with the science of criticism to be convinced of this, for a very ordinary mind must grasp the fact that the authors of the Gospels were utterly incapable, as far as their mere intellects could aid them, of giving such an appearance of probability to a work of imagination. And how is it that the four Evangelists are in such accord when they present the ideal Christ? Must they not have had the real, historic Christ before their minds? Listen to Rousseau on this matter: "Shall we call the gospel-history an invention? My friend, inventions are not made in that manner, and the facts of the life of Socrates, concerning which no one doubts, are not attested as well as those of the life of Jesus Christ. After all, to call the gospel-history an invention, would be an avoidance rather than a solution of the difficulty. It is much more probable that one and the same person was the subject of these books, than that four men agreed in their fabrication. Jewish writers could never have excogitated such a tone and such a morality; and the Gospel presents characteristics of truth so striking and inimitable, that its inventor would be more astounding than its hero."¹ History and our own experience convince us that a union of the real and the ideal is impossible in the natural order; therefore, in Jesus Christ, uniting these so different elements in His visible nature, we recognize the Messenger of God, nay, the Divinity, with its most sublime attributes. The life of the Buddha, even as it is traced by his most impassioned votaries, is

¹ *Émile*, I. IV.—We avail ourselves of the opportunity furnished by this quotation, to draw the reader's attention to Le Noir's appreciation of Rousseau: "Every one is familiar with the vagaries of this democratic character, this adventurer and misanthrope, influenced for evil, in matters of practical morality, by the depravity of his times; every one is acquainted with his impassioned style, the reflection of his very soul, as well as of his paradoxical genius. Let us admit that he deserves consideration for having expressed, in his age of ice, an ardent admiration for the Gospel, and for having been, throughout his life, a Christian in sentiment. Let us also admit that he deserves, as one of the greatest writers who ever lived, and as a profoundly theistic democrat, a place alongside of Fénelon in the temple of art. Rousseau is one of those who, compared with the atheists of our day, lead all just minds to apply to them the saying of Jesus to His disciples: 'He who is not against you is with you.'"

far removed from the ideal, a search for which, in union with the real, is the object of every religion.

"Believe in My works," said Jesus Christ. Moral proofs may influence individuals, here and there; but miracles impress all persons, and if they were of no value in determining the truth of a religion, atheists would not be so anxious to disprove them. A monotheist religion naturally relies upon miracles as a presumption in its favor, for such a religion presents God the Creator as the master of nature—as One who *can* work miracles; and were God to withhold a sanction, through His miraculous interposition, of the presented system, man would prefer to rely on the light of his own reason. Now in all the alleged miracles outside of Christianity, it is at least difficult to decide what is illusion or imposture, and what preternatural; and if we are ever forced to acknowledge the preternatural in any such adduced facts, it may be ascribed to a demon. As to the miracles of Sakya Muni, let us ignore the suspicious fact that they were first mentioned several centuries after his death, and accept them as phenomena. But even the Buddhists do not attribute them to divine power, but to magic, one of the Buddha's natural acquisitions; and it is evident that a man may be a powerful magician, and yet a teacher of error. In the Gospel, we find a series of miracles performed in designated places, at definite times, in the presence of many, and of such a description that a natural explanation of them is impossible.

Christian polemics have always adduced the marvellously rapid propagation of their religion in proof of its divine origin. They all felt like saying with Richard of St. Victor: "If, O Lord, my faith be an error—which is an impossibility—Thou art the deceiver; for Thou hast permitted Christianity to be marked with signs which plainly show the imprint of Thy omnipotent hand." Our modern atheists are fond of rebutting this argument by instancing the rapid diffusion of Buddhism; but they fail to remark the immense difference between the natures of the two religions—a difference which would have augured, if considered from a merely human point of view, success for Buddhism and failure for Christianity. Christianity called on the proud Quirites to abandon a religious system which permeated every fibre of their social and political fabric; to forsake deities to whose care they ascribed the advance of Rome from the humble state of a petty hamlet to the position of mistress of the world; to hurl these deities from Olympus, and cast them into the realm of nothingness, or perhaps into the shades of hell. But Buddhism called for no change of dogmatic belief. Christianity asked Rome to acknowledge as teachers men of a hated race, poor and ignorant fishermen, plebeian foreigners; to adopt a moral system, diametrically opposed to all the vices which

paganism sanctioned and encouraged; to adore as God a citizen of despised Judæa, only lately crucified as an impostor by a Roman governor. Buddhism did not pretend to speak in the name of God; it made no radical changes in social life,¹ and especially none in regard to the relation of the sexes; it imposed no new mysteries, and the Buddhists of Japan even flatter themselves that they need not admit a God-Creator. Christianity first manifested itself without any paraphernalia of glory or social standing; the Buddha was the son of a king, and his first disciples and converts were men of the superior classes. The persecutions of Christianity were terrible, and endured for three centuries. Dodwell, Voltaire, and Gibbon may try to belittle them, but they are authenticated by contemporary and trustworthy writers. As Lactantius (260–325) says of the Roman persecutors: “They tortured the Christians with the most exquisite kinds of punishments; they used all the powers of their slaughter-house, as though they thirsted for blood. What Caucasus or India ever raised such ruthless and sanguinary beasts? That person is a beast, by whose single wish the purple gore everywhere flows. Everywhere are cruel tears, panic, and the multiplied image of death. No one can rightly describe the ferocity of this animal, which, though it crouches in one spot, nevertheless grinds its iron teeth throughout the universe, and not only devours the

¹ It has been asserted that Buddhism condemned and destroyed the system of castes wherever it prevailed. Now we know *a priori* that it could not have done this, for it furnished the human conscience with no new conception of justice which would serve as a basis of such condemnation. Buddhism recognized the transmigration of souls as forming its fundamental dogma, and the system of castes was its fatal consequence. Eugene Burnouf (*loc. cit.*, p. 210), who devoted more study to this matter than any other orientalist, says that “Sakia Muni admitted a hierarchy of castes, and explained it just as the Brahmins did, by the theory of rewards and punishments. Whenever he instructed a man of inferior condition, he taught him that his lowliness of origin was the consequence of the crimes committed in his previous existences. The conversion of a man, according to Sakia, was tantamount to giving him a means of escape from the law of transmigration; it was an absolute and relative liberation from a vitiated birth—*absolute*, by putting him in the way of attaining definite annihilation (this we cannot admit); *relative*, by making him a religious like Sakia himself. Therefore, Sakia opened the way of Heaven to all castes, whereas before his advent, that way had been closed to many; and he made them equal to himself and to each other by granting them the religious investiture. . . . We perceive how we must understand that famous axiom of Oriental history, according to which Buddhism effaced all distinction of castes. The writers who have repeated this assertion have fancied that it is verified by the condition of such people as profess Buddhism in our day. But there is a noteworthy exception which has not received sufficient attention. If caste distinctions are unknown to the Buddhist nations of Thibet, Burmah, and Siam, they are very firmly established among that people who first adopted Buddhism, the Singhalese, The instance of Ceylon allows us to suppose that the phenomenon of a co-existence of Buddhism and castes was also seen in India in the olden time, and a study of the *Sutras* fully confirms the supposition.” Nevertheless, Buddhism did directly oppose the Brahmanic caste, denying its mission and social function, and transferring these to religions taken from all castes.

entrails of men, but crunches their very bones, and even rages against their ashes, lest they should find a burial-place." Even the most clement of the pagan Roman emperors were persecutors of Christianity. Antoninus Pius, often lauded for goodness, was one, as is shown by inscriptions in the catacombs,¹ and by Justin Martyr². That even Marcus Aurelius, whose "Meditations" seem to breathe a Christian spirit, was a persecutor, is proved by the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, and by the contemporary "Apologies" of Apollinaris, Athenagoras, and Miltiades. That Trajan, one of the "good princes," also persecuted the Christians, is evinced by the martyrdoms of Popes Clement (Romanus), Evarist, and Alexander; of St. Ignatius of Antioch and of St. Simeon (son of Cleophas); and of Sts. Nereus, Achilleus, Sulpitius, Severianus, and Cæsareus—all well authenticated; and by the "Acts of St. Ignatius," the genuineness of which is defended by the Protestants, Usher and Pearson. But how different from all this is the picture furnished by the infancy of Buddhism. Everywhere this system was established with the aid of the civil power. Sakya Muni was protected by King Bimbisara, and when the reformer died, the Princes of Malava presided at the funeral. The first foreign missions of Buddhism were inaugurated by the great conqueror, Asoka Pyiadasi; before his reign, the new system was professed only by some obscure ascetics of Magadha. It was Mahendra, son of Asoka, who carried Buddhism into Ceylon. Kanishka, an Indo-Scythian, King of Cashmere, first developed it in Tartary. Chubilai, successor of Genghis Khan, established it among the Mongols. Finally, the doctrinal feebleness of Buddhism was greatly favorable to its propagation, whereas the pure monotheism and precision of doctrine presented by Christianity ought, humanly speaking, to have prevented its success. Buddhist missionaries would have found no difficulty, as did the Holy See in the famous question of the Chinese ceremonies. They were ever willing to adopt all superstitions.

But while the arguments above adduced forbid our admitting in Buddhism the transcendent qualities which place Christianity above every religion, we must avow that it has exercised a beneficent influence over the minds and hearts of the people who have accepted it. Especially in Mongolia, Thibet, and Ceylon, it has effected much in the way of social pacification, by mollifying the dispositions of men. Benevolence, at least to some extent, is now known where once destructive passions held sway. We can scarcely realize the possibility of a Genghis Khan or a Tamerlane reappearing in these regions. It is generally admitted that rapine and

¹ ARRINGHI, *Subterranean Rome*, b. iii., ch. 22.

² *Apologia*, num. i.

murder are now no more rampant in Buddhist lands than in the civilized West, and to Buddhism must be accorded much of the credit for the great change. "At the time of Genghis Khan," says Abel Rémusat, "the ferocity of the Turkish race was equalled by that of the Mongol; which the former had temporarily subjugated. The Turkish race has persevered in its attachment to Islamism, and the fanaticism of an intolerant system has served to confirm its turbulent habits and its disposition to carnage and rapine. But the Mongolian races have successively embraced Buddhism, and to it is due the change in their characters. As pacific now as they formerly were savage and indocile, they are devoted exclusively to the care of their flocks."¹ The same may be said of the Thibetans who, now that they are Buddhists, are a lettered and a comparatively refined people; whereas, in their ante-Buddhistic days, they were wont to eat their dead. Of course, Christian influence has contributed not a little to this amelioration, and Taine errs when he ignores it; but there is much truth in his remark that, "if, like so many drops of water in a vessel, all the benevolence and humanity in the civil and domestic life of Asia could be collected, it would be found that the good Buddhist river has furnished the greater part."² Another trait of Buddhist people is a spirit of religious tolerance. Even Asoka, the Constantine of Buddhism, zealous propagandist as he was, always commanded the various sects in his dominions to observe mutual respect and concord. Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire cannot account for this characteristic; it cannot come, he thinks, from the superior reason of the Buddhists, for it is not to be believed that these people developed so delicate a matter, when they were so profoundly ignorant concerning some of more easy acquisition; it cannot come from indifference, for they show intense religious fervor in the great number of monuments which they have consecrated to their belief. Pillon finds a key to the mystery in the pantheistic character of Buddhism, which excludes any "divine monarchism." We agree with Le Noir, who thinks there is no need of seeking an explanation of this tolerance outside of the Buddhist system of morality—that part of religion to which Sakya Muni attached the greatest importance, and which is exceedingly mild and tolerant, for it commands its adepts to bear everything with patience, and it will not allow even animals to be unnecessarily hurt.

¹ *Mélanges Critiques*, vol. i.² *Nouveaux Essais de Critique et d'Histoire*.

TWENTY-FOUR YEARS IN BUENOS AYRES.

I.

IN 1856 the Sisters of Mercy were seen for the first time in the straight streets and flowery *plazas* of Buenos Ayres. A large tide of European emigration had been turning towards the Argentine Republic, and these Religieuses had come at the urgent call of the authorities, civil and religious, to minister to the pressing wants of the native and foreign population, and establish schools and hospitals throughout the territory. The above joint applications had been made to the parent house at Dublin, and Archbishop Cullen and Mother M. Vincent Whitty took the deepest interest in this first South American foundation. The former gave a special blessing to the courageous volunteers, bade them apply to him as to a father in any contingency that might arise in their new field of labor, and rely on his aid in every emergency. The latter gave them a warm maternal benediction, made every possible arrangement for their spiritual and temporal weal, and followed them with love and prayers over the vast watery expanse which she herself has since crossed more than once.

It was, therefore, with deep spiritual joy and high hopes that the little band of five sisters turned their faces southward on the Feast of the Kings, January 6, 1856, and set out on their toilsome journey from the Liffey to the Rio de la Plata. Cheerfully did they bear the terrible heat of the Torrid Zone, the monotonous days, the trying tediousness of that lengthy voyage. While most of the passengers, enervated by the fierce tropical sun, lay stretched out as if dead, they were up and doing. The cooler weather of the South Temperate Zone, and its beautiful starry skies, were a relief and a joy to them. On the 24th of February, after a prosperous voyage, their vessel cast anchor in the immense river along whose shore stretches Buenos Ayres. A tug brought them near land, and in a few moments they briskly clambered down its sides to the boat that was to land them opposite their provisional convent. For two years they resided in a private house in *Calle Merced*, whence they removed to the fine convent in *Calle Rio Bamba*, built for them by the Irish people. Dr. Excalada,¹ the saintly old Archbishop, heartily welcomed them to his episcopal city.

¹ This holy man died at Rome during the Vatican Council. So highly did the people venerate him that they had his remains brought back and deposited in his Cathedral. He was succeeded by his Vicar-General, the present incumbent, Dr. Anieros.

Buenos Ayres was not, in 1856, the beautiful city it has since become. It was, however, unique in the eyes of the newcomers. Its long narrow streets, stretching into the pampas, were lined with low, white houses of adobe or sun-dried brick, surrounded, in Spanish fashion, by gardens, and shaded by trees which have long since given place to unsightly telegraph and telephone poles. Here and there were large stone churches outlined against the sky, Moorish arcades, and low private palaces, carved and pillared; through whose arched windows the sun rarely penetrated. It had, and still has, many beautiful public squares, a healthy Spanish custom which other nations are too slow to adopt. From the unsurpassed salubrity of the climate, the city and province have been called *Buenos Ayres* (good air).¹

But neither Dr. Cullen nor the Mother Superior understood the circumstances of the country which had so earnestly begged through its one Archbishop, and its chief magistrate, for a branch of the Mercy Order. They did not remember, if, indeed, they ever knew, that "the revolution of '48 had caused the scum of Italy to migrate to that once peaceful land," men who, "by their numbers and wicked organizations, were destined to make ruin, anarchy, and irreligion the order of the day, set the government at defiance, and establish a reign of terror." Nor were the home authorities aware, in those days of little steam and less telegraph, that a fearful epidemic was raging in the city to which they missioned the devoted band.

Yes, when the Sisters arrived, it was not the red flag but the yellow—not the demon of periodic revolution, but the Angel of Death—that hovered over the fair city. They had no work to do as educators, but, entirely unacclimated as they were, their services were at once called into requisition as nurses. Their days and nights were spent assisting the sick and preparing the dying for the better land. The whole town was laid waste by yellow fever. The worst cases were sent to the Lazaretto, and of this temple of horrors they at once took charge. The *pamperos* or prairie wind was supposed to have brought the plague. The very atmosphere was pestilence-laden; its boasted salubrity had vanished. Buenos Ayres had become the city of bad air. Every breath they inhaled was poison. Yet they drank of the deadly thing and it hurt them not.

The horrible scenes peculiar to epidemics were enacted over and over again. Frightened wretches forsook their nearest and dearest. Panic-stricken crowds fled to the country. At the first approach of peril, the infidel party had rushed madly towards the shadows

¹ "Santissima Trinidad de Buenos Ayres" was the name given the city by the Spaniards who planned it.

of the snow-capped Andes; and on their return, when the last vestige of the plague had disappeared, the heroic charity of a few poor women, strangers in the land, compelled their admiration and esteem.

II.

Yellow fever came again and again, and history repeated itself. In the pestilence of 1871, the official report gave the number of deaths as 13,000, but 20,000 would be nearer the truth. Eight of the sisters were prostrated, as much by exhaustion produced by incessant nursing as by disease, yet not one died. What they underwent on these occasions no tongue could tell, no pen describe. But their labors and sacrifices were all for One who, on the great accounting day, will reward even a cup of cold water given in His name.

After each terrific visitation a period of comparative quiet followed. On account of their skill as nurses, and their success in saving cases which even the medical men deemed hopeless, the whole population was at such times, figuratively, at their feet. The State vied with the Church in doing them honor, and styled them the saviours of the city. The Sisters took advantage of one of these favorable epochs in their history to build a fine hospital—a necessary adjunct to a city always menaced and often visited by yellow fever. The site was selected in Rio Bamba, the highest quarter of Buenos Ayres; and the institution, open to all kinds of fevers, attained, under their able superintendence, a high degree of efficiency.

III.

Delightful climate and wonderfully productive soil characterize most of the Spanish-American republics. But these and other advantages are all but neutralized by the chronic instability of the governments; and revolutions are almost as common as floods, earthquakes, or epidemics. A group of daring men at home, any collection of *carbonari* from abroad, may be able to upset the firmest government yet established in these territories. Between 1810 and 1835 there were thirty-six changes of government in Buenos Ayres; and many have since occurred. Every change brought trouble to the sisterhood. The despotism of the "blood and iron" Don Manuel Rosas, who styled himself "the Eternal," had but recently ceased when the Sisters of Mercy were invited to the country. Indeed, the so-called liberal party, with a fine sense that liberty consists in license to crush all who venture to dissent from one's peculiar views, had been playing at annoying or suppressing convents from its advent to the beautiful region to which it has been such a scourge. And if, by fits and starts, it tolerated

the Sisters of Mercy—the only *religious*es within the limits of the republic for the twenty-four years of their residence in Buenos Ayres—it was because of the immense advantages society derived from that devoted body of women, the only trained nurses and teachers then in the country.

With the exception of New Orleans Buenos Ayres is, perhaps, the most cosmopolitan city in the world. On the arrival of the Sisters about one-third of the population was European. Italians were the most numerous of this contingent. There were also Spaniards, Irish, French, Americans, Germans, English, Gauchos, Negroes, Indians, poor specimens of the Children of the Sun—a sprinkling of mestizos and mulattoes—in short, of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation. Spanish, and Spanish spoken with an Italian accent, and English, were the chief languages heard on the streets. Canon Fahy, their chief friend among the clergy, wished the Sisters to be specially beneficial to the Irish settlers. But these, for the most part, wisely kept aloof from the city. They were very much scattered. As stock raisers and wool farmers they may be said to have developed a new industry and added a new article to the commerce of the country. Their occupation kept them at a distance on large *estancias* or cattle farms, where they have become the most extensive sheep-raisers in the world. Sometimes an Argentine *caballero*, splendidly mounted, his horse and saddle, solid silver stirrups and pommels, worth a small fortune, his shoulders draped with the national poncho (blanket), drew up before the convent-gate, and spoke to them with the accent of Cork or Donegal—an *estanciero*, thoroughly naturalized. But, on the whole, they saw little of their country-people. All Argentines, whether by birth or adoption, were equally the objects of their zeal.

Boarding-schools were soon added to their convent. A second convent was founded at Mercedes, two hours distant by rail. An orphanage and a house of mercy adjoined each institution. All this was done in the face of almost unceasing opposition from the infidel party, which too often held sway in the Southern Republic. While their charity was remembered they were unmolested in their works of education and benevolence. But such remembrance was short-lived. "Ah," said a holy Jesuit to them on their arrival, "I know you expect the cross, for, as you say, the cross is everywhere. But it is much larger in South America than elsewhere." The enemies of religion were compact and thoroughly organized; the good people were scattered and without a leader. Liberty too often degenerated into license. The men in power seemed incapable of understanding that all the inhabitants of a republic are equally entitled to its privileges, provided they observe its laws.

IV.

The leader of the Buenos Ayres Sisterhood, Mother M. Evangelista Fitzpatrick, in every sense a superior woman, was born in Dublin on Christmas Eve, 1822, of parents remarkable for piety, charity, and intellectual endowments. Her father, who was well known in the literary circles of his day, took an active part with O'Connell against the *Veto* and for Emancipation. His charity was unbounded. He was called the father of orphans. His wife cordially seconded his charitable plans. The virtues of the parents passed to their offspring. One of their sons fell as a missionary chaplain at Kyper Pass, India. Another sacrificed his life for his flock in a distant western state. Even in this family of apostles Mother M. Evangelista was distinguished from childhood for tender piety and unlimited charity. She showed a real personal love for the poor and helpless—beautiful traits fostered by prayer and the saintly example of her parents.

No one was surprised when this lovely, accomplished girl left all for Christ, and became a Sister of Mercy at the age of twenty-two, a period of life when the world holds forth its fairest charms. She was received by Mother M. Cecelia Marmion, whose death she so beautifully describes in a letter quoted in the second volume of "Leaves from the Annals of the Sisters of Mercy."

As a novice she exhibited the virtues characteristic of her long religious life—solid, unaffected piety, self-denial, charity, and exact observance of rule. During the cholera of 1849 she was the life and soul of the Sisters appointed to minister to the victims of that awful disease in the camp or shed hospitals at Glasnevin. Here she gained the skill and experience that stood her in good stead beneath the Southern Cross. It used to be said that cholera never passed the equator. But the cholera at Buenos Ayres in 1873 was only less dreadful than the epidemic of yellow fever in 1871. Mother M. Evangelista was attacked at the midnight Mass, at Christmas, and the Sisters had a sad feast. Though at death's door for several days, God gave her back to their prayers.

When it was decided to respond to the Argentine appeal Mother M. Evangelista was named Superior of the valiant band destined for that distant and most uninviting mission. From the first the undertaking was full of crosses and contradictions. These served to show the true spirit of the holy Mother, who was subsequently styled "the Apostle of Buenos Ayres." The natives, the Spanish settlers, and the government (before it fell under infidel influence) were most kind to the Sisters. And even the infidel party, at once bold and unscrupulous, could not always hold out against the heroic charity of the good Mother and her worthy daughters.

More than once it challenged their admiration, and compelled them to allow periods of comparative calm to those whom they professed to admire. The Christmas season, which is midsummer in that region, was frequently saddened by pestilence. On these occasions the Sisters dropped everything to devote themselves to the stricken, often abandoned by fathers, brothers, and husbands; and sometimes—alas, for poor human nature—by sisters, wives, and even mothers.

V.

The most dreadful experience of the devoted Mother and her children came in the summer and autumn of 1875. Towards Christmas, that epoch of peace and good-will, their calm courage and self-denying charity were completely ignored by the enemies of religion, and threats of vengeance against them were heard, now aloud, again in smothered tones. The infidel party, reinforced by communists, had become the dominant one. In February a revolution broke out, and scenes were re-enacted which had a few years before been the order of the day in Paris. The Jesuits and the Sisters of Mercy, being the only religious in the city, were marked out for destruction. The massacre of the archbishop was decreed in a sort of secret consistory, and a partial execution of these murderous enactments quickly followed. Early on Sunday, February 28th, the mob marched from the port, where they had assembled before dawn, to the episcopal palace. Not finding the archbishop, they smashed the windows and furniture, defaced the massive, many-pillared cathedral, crying out meanwhile that their thirst for vengeance could be slaked only by his blood. They next proceeded to the beautiful church of St. Ignatius, which they speedily demolished. On the preceding day the Jesuit Fathers, by the advice of friends, had asked protection from the government; but the president paid no attention to the petition—save to resolve that no aid from him should reach the petitioners—and stealthily withdrew to his country house. Yet they seem to have relied on some measure of protection, for they did not leave the city, nor do anything towards saving their property.

In times of revolution, in Spanish-American countries, the chief executive, for the time being, is rather a dictator than a constitutional ruler.

The Jesuit college, San Salvador, a monster edifice¹ that accommodated four hundred boarders and an immense number of day students, was one of the most magnificent educational establishments in the world. Twenty-four grand pianos, with other musi-

¹ Unlike most other structures in Buenos Ayres, it was four stories high, and built chiefly of glass and iron.

cal instruments, were disposed about the spacious main hall, the walls of which were covered with cases containing vast stores of scientific instruments. A collegiate church of exquisite workmanship had just been completed for the use of the students. Everything was sacrificed by the mob, an assemblage of so-called gentlemen. The college was on the Calle Rio Bamba, opposite the Convent of Mercy. Mother M. Evangelista and her household suffered the most poignant anguish as the shouts of the demoniac procession, parading the principal streets, reached their ears. Amid blasphemies and savage execrations they could distinguish the ominous words: "First the Jesuits, and then the Sisters of Mercy!"

VI.

But we shall let an eye-witness still further describe the terrible scene:

"When the mob, consisting of several thousands, reached the college, forty Fathers and scholastics were at recreation in the garden. Savage cries for their blood, the noise of breaking doors and the crashing of glass fell upon their ears. The rooms and corridors were soon filled with wild beings in human form, who, with yells and curses, smashed everything that would yield to their clubs and hatchets. Over what remained they poured petroleum, and in a moment all was ablaze within and without, for petroleum had also been applied to the beds and broken furniture which had been dashed from the college windows. Like fiends they burst into the chapel, and threw vestments, chalices, and pictures into the blazing pile. A fresh supply of the murderous fluid reduced to ashes the priceless treasures of the library which it had taken years to collect.

"A splendid picture of the Sacred Heart was carried out with every term of blasphemy, and held up by one of the wretches while another transpierced it with a javelin amid indescribable insults. This fearful outrage did not go unpunished, for one of his own vile companions plunged a sword into his body, and the wretched creature fell dead. The Most Adorable Sacrament was taken from the tabernacle and flung into the street."

At this stage of the diabolical proceedings Maria Lasagna, a poor Italian woman, broke into the infuriated rabble, and, on her knees, gathered, as best she could, the Adorable Fragments, with a heroism greater than that of the pious Veronica. To the convent she hastened with the Precious Burden, saying, as she deposited It with the kneeling Sister at the gate: "I must go back and try to save my Lord from further insult." And back again went Maria Lasagna. And though beaten and cursed by the furies

whose every move was a new sacrilege, she desisted not, but reverently gathered the Sacred Particles, mingled with clay and ashes and the blood of the wretch that had led the riot, now a corpse.

Bitter were the tears shed by the afflicted Sisters. In presence of these awful sacrileges the loving heroism of Mother M. Evangelista made her oblivious of danger. Falling prostrate on the ground at the convent gate, she made burning acts of reparation to her outraged Lord, heedless of the shouts and threats of the mob. "O my Jesus!" she frequently exclaimed, "that I should see Thee thus outraged!" By a special intervention of Providence the convent was saved. The French Consul did good service, yet the mob had broken open the chapel doors when a voice was heard: "Not there." The orphans, boarders, and inmates of the House of Mercy gathered around Reverend Mother, who, kneeling before the Blessed Sacrament, recited the rosary in Reparation. All night long they watched before the Tabernacle, the Mother's heart broken with indescribable anguish. To the hour of her death, eleven years later, the howlings of these fiends, their wild revolutionary songs, and their horrible imprecations rang in her ears. That miserable Sunday was as the first Good Friday in the streets of Jerusalem. Constantly she shed torrents of tears, crying out from the depths of her loving heart: "O that my sweet Lord should be so treated by His own creatures!"

Next morning a priest, disguised as a gardener, said Mass for the community. He continued to do this daily, at the peril of his life, during the reign of terror, which lasted till April, 1875. The patient heroism of the good Mother sustained her large family till peace was once more proclaimed, as in Warsaw. Divine vengeance overtook some of the ringleaders on the spot. Three, who had put on the habits of the Jesuits they had murdered, were mistaken for real Jesuits by their comrades in iniquity, and, despite their declarations and curses to prove they were not members of that obnoxious body, were cut to pieces. A few more were killed by savage spirits who, not finding any more religious to kill, thirsted for the blood of their companions.

VII.

The Convent of Mercy nearest Buenos Ayres was that of New Orleans, and between the houses there existed warm attachment and friendly sympathy. Some two years after the hideous events just narrated Mother M. Evangelista gives a harrowing picture of the condition of the community:

"How could I enter into our history? Truly, it would seem incredible. We are now (1877) here over twenty-one years, and so far from being securely established, or from flourishing, the

probabilities are that we shall be sent away in the end. The Free Masons are most powerful, and are laboring hard against religion. And the worst of it is that, though there are many good people scattered here and there, they are not united as a body, neither have they any one to lead or rouse them. There are also communists here in superabundance.

"The Jesuit College on the other side of our street was burned by no mob—at least the mobs were employed by gentlemen (?), government officials, etc. It was done in open daylight, and the government purposely delayed sending troops to stop the work of destruction till it was too late. Part of their programme was to destroy our convent. The cry was raised and the men had attacked the chapel, when a voice which all heard, but none could trace to any visible mouth, called them off. This was repeated three times, till at length they desisted from their attempt.

"But it is not only the hatred of the wicked that proves a cross. Were it merely that it would rather serve to reanimate our zeal in the good cause. But, and especially since the burning of the Jesuits' College, we are left almost powerless for good. I cannot venture to explain *how* this happens. In fact, we have steady, quiet opposers in those who ought to help us. The Irish, as a body, are scattered from fifty to hundreds of miles out in the camp; you see we cannot deal directly with them. . . . We have had crosses almost unceasingly. Deaths of Sisters far beyond the average; sickness and deaths among the children; steady, continued calumnies against us; false friends; bad priests. We are in God's hands—that is our comfort. Were you to hear our story you would think it strange indeed. The bad here have a most particular hatred against the Jesuits and the Sisters of Mercy. Why they thus honor us I know not.

"Pray for us. Better be turned away than remain in danger of hereafter degenerating. . . . We are twenty-six in all. We have a branch at Mercedes, and a House of Mercy beside us. We have eighty poor Spanish and Italian children in one of our schools, who are perpetually coming and going. The infamous state schools now established aim at destroying the morals as well as the faith of the children. And parents are to be fined if they don't send them to these pompous dens of vice. The profits of our boarding-school help us to support thirty poor orphans."

Any one at all conversant with the state of things in Spanish-American countries will understand that, after the expulsion of the Jesuits and the lamented death of good Canon Fahy, it was scarcely possible for the Sisters of Mercy to remain in Buenos Ayres. For years Mother M. Evangelista had been anxious to follow the Divine counsel, "When they persecute you in one city flee to an-

other." The New Orleans community sought to procure the blessing of receiving the Buenos Ayres Sisters, martyrs in desire and almost in fact. But the Argentine metropolitan refused to part with what he was wont to call the gem of his unfortunate diocese. His great affection for the Sisters made him unwilling to let them go. "What!" he exclaimed, when leave was asked, "allow the Sisters of Mercy, who have never given me anything but consolation, to leave my diocese! No; it cannot be. I will not part with them." But the place did not suit the Sisters of Mercy at the time. They had noble, generous friends, but they had also dreadful enemies, from whom the archbishop was powerless to shield them.

Other means failing, the infidel party sought to effect their ruin by forcing them to receive unsuitable subjects. Mother Evangelista, while speaking them fair, would not allow them to interfere with her family any more than she interfered with theirs. Once they strove to compel her to receive as a member a person who was not even baptized.

"I cannot express to you," she wrote to her New Orleans friend, "what a consolation your kind letters and sympathy have been to me. Cut off, isolated as we are from other convents of our Order owing to great distance, sympathy is to us peculiarly sweet. Prospects are no brighter than when last I wrote, but I have great hopes that things are coming to a climax, and that our dear Lord will, before long, bring us where we may have our works and be delivered from the dangers which threaten us here. As regards what you kindly propose, I will tell you frankly I could not think of undertaking anything of my own will, choice, or judgment. What I intend doing is to get leave from the archbishop to go to Ireland on some business I have there next June. When there I will consult Cardinal Cullen, who sent us here, making known to him all the difficulties that surround us, and following his advice as to whether we shall leave, and whither we shall go."

"You may guess how secret I have to keep this. For, suppose Cardinal Cullen tells us to stay until we are driven out, you may imagine the inconveniences that would result from its being known that I consulted him. Father Fahy was a great loss to us. The archbishop is good and friendly, but he is very timid, has little energy, and has seen nothing better than what exists here. The truth is, the poor man can do little or nothing. Continue to pray for us. Prayer is our only hope."

VIII.

When June, 1878, came, Mother M. Evangelista was unable to get off. There had been another revolution, and she was privately

advised to wait and see what policy would be adopted in religious affairs. In any case, she would not go just then, fearing that a persecution might arise in her absence. The new government was no improvement on its predecessor. On the first of May, 1879, the good Mother and a companion started for home. They met with the kindest of captains and officers, all Protestants. In England and Ireland friends were not wanting. All to whom they could venture to explain their circumstances advised them to quit the city of good air as soon as possible. When the Mother Superior reached Dublin her early friend, Cardinal Cullen, had passed away, but Archbishop McCabe did for her all that his predecessor could have done, save to revive the memories and friendship of bygone years.

It was necessary to apply to Rome for authorization for the withdrawal of the Buenos Ayres sisterhood, "and," writes Mother M. Evangelista, "a most influential bishop" (who we have reason to believe is the present Australian Cardinal) "kindly and charitably undertook the whole affair for me. Meanwhile I was advised to return to Buenos Ayres, and do all I could to get leave of the bishop there. I did so, and in the end, after much suffering, succeeded." She speaks in the highest terms of the hospitality and courtesy of the convents at which she stopped: "I was overwhelmed with kindness in Ireland, and the same in England, with one solitary exception, which shall be nameless. May God enlighten said house to see the excellence and beauty of Christian hospitality, 'using hospitality one towards another, without murmuring.'" She made arrangements for the transfer of the whole community to Adelaide, South Australia. Many prelates were anxious to secure their services, but by the advice of their special friend, Bishop Moran, now Cardinal Archbishop of Sydney, they accepted the invitation of Dr. Reynolds, then bishop, now archbishop, of Adelaide, who regarded them as confessors, if not martyrs, and felt that his diocese was blessed in securing them. "My diocese," he wrote, "is very large, and my people are doing their best for the extension of religion and Catholic education. We are surrounded by many temporal difficulties, yet come to us in the name of God! I promise you, for myself and people, and the colonists generally, a peaceful home for your community, and as vast a field for your zeal as Sisters of Mercy as your hearts can desire. Come, then, in God's name."

On her return to Buenos Ayres, the Mother Superior at once prepared to leave with her beloved Sisters. Money given her for the support of orphans and other charitable works she placed in the hands of a responsible committee, and she made the best arrangements possible, under the peculiar circumstances, for perpetuating

the benevolent works the Sisters had originated. She left full power of attorney to two responsible gentlemen to represent the community in the settlement of their property, since sold for the equivalent of nearly one hundred and fifty-one thousand dollars.

At an early hour, February 8th, 1880, all the English-speaking priests in the city said Mass in the convent chapel. The last was celebrated by the Dean, who purified the sacred vessels. At 11 the house was crowded with the relatives and friends of the Sisters, several of whom, being Irish-Argentines and Spaniards, saw their parents for the last time on earth. Copious was the tear-shedding, as they took their places in the carriages which conveyed them to the Boca, where they embarked for the Outer Roads.

The deepest regret was felt at their departure, for they were singularly beloved by the people. Yet it was expedient for them to go; and their nearest and dearest said not a word of disapproval, keenly as they felt the separation. Were the Argentine Confederation like the great republic at the other end of the American continent, never would they have left its shores.' It is impossible to detail all the causes that led to this result, so deplored by the friends of order and religion throughout the country. Nor have these friends been without a confident hope that, in happier days, the dark-robed Sisters to whom they were so loyal in times of sorrow and peril, will again gladden the land. But of those who sailed on the Royal Mail, *Guadiana*, on the memorable 8th of February, 1880, none will again see the River of Silver.

Sixteen Sisters of Mercy have slept their last sleep in the Argentine capital, and await the resurrection in a beautiful cemetery, where the friends of the order "see that their graves are kept green" and decked with the choicest flowers.

IX.

On reaching England, the Sisters took their places in the very next vessel that started for Australia. Easter Sunday they spent at Madeira. When they stopped at the Cape of Good Hope for water, Bishop Leonard came on board to visit them. He thought the party too large for Adelaide, and asked for a few to begin the good work in a convent he had just finished. But to Adelaide all had been sent, and the good Mother did not feel authorized to change the destination of any. Shortly after, Bishop Leonard went to Ireland for Sisters of Mercy. In less than three months from the date of leaving South America, the Buenos Ayres Religious were established in their Australian home, May 3. Here they found the coveted peace. Their co-religionists welcomed them with effusion, and those who differed from them in creed were kindly disposed towards them, and not unwilling to aid their efforts

for the relief of the suffering and the enlightenment of the ignorant. The alternating terrors, surprises, and petty annoyances of Mother M. Evangelista's South American experience, made her value the quiet of her new home. "Verily," she would say, "Australia is a land of peace and liberty."

"Buenos Ayres," she wrote, "is not a place for our order, and will not be for years to come. Often when ill there (for I had very poor health, owing, I think, to anxiety of mind), I felt I could gladly lay down my life, but for the thought of leaving my beloved Sisters so unprotected in such a country. Now, thank God, I can die with a mind easy on that head. We are really in a Christian land. There were more priests there than here, and ten times as many churches, but the whole state of things was different. To explain all would be simply impossible. Some things on which all the others hinge I am not at liberty to mention. And to give a superficial explanation would be as repugnant to my nature as unsatisfactory to you. We must only let the dead past bury its dead."

"We are not as well off temporally as we were in South America, but our peace and happiness in other ways are beyond explanation. I never look back to our sojourn in Buenos Ayres, save to bless God for His wonderful deliverance of us from its dangers. Our home was undermined by communists. This had nothing to do with our first motive in resolving to leave. But it certainly increased our joy when we got permission, and our gratitude to God when we learned that another revolution broke out shortly after we left."

The six years of Mother M. Evangelista's residence in Adelaide were years of toil and progress. Now that she was free from mental anxiety of the worst species, her health improved greatly. On June 21, 1886, she became slightly ill. Her sufferings, borne with exemplary patience, increased hourly, but there was nothing to alarm her loving children. On the 29th, the doctor found her almost well; and she declared herself quite well. The bishop came to her room and was about to compliment her on her healthy appearance, when she suddenly said: "Bless me, my Lord, I am dying." He placed his indulgence cross in her hands and gave her absolution as she closed her eyes in death, without a single struggle, as if going to sleep. She was in the sixty-fourth year of her age, and had spent forty-two years in Religion. Her last act befitting her singularly holy life—an instruction on devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Within the convent and outside of it, her death was lamented as the greatest calamity that could befall religion and education in South Australia. Her talent for governing was of the highest order, and she had the faculty, so precious to one in

her responsible position, of winning the love of all who came in contact with her. Though never free from the cross, she was always cheerful, even gay. "She had lived the life of a saint," said one of her devoted children, "and died the death of one."

X.

Despite the almost constant persecution the community endured in Buenos Ayres, the Mother Superior kept up its intellectual life. She sent to Dublin, London, and the United States for the best works on subjects of interest to her flock; and her letters frequently bewail the difficulty of getting direct the literary treasures she coveted. "Books and periodicals are often delayed," she wrote; "the *Meditations* have not yet come, but I expect them. I got some American books lately that could not be got in England, on Natural Philosophy, etc." She was a woman of exceptional literary gifts. Her knowledge of Spanish and other languages was most useful in cosmopolitan Buenos Ayres. She had a great facility for translating or adapting the beauties of other tongues into English or Spanish. Her translations of the *Dies Iræ*, the *Lauda Sion*, and the verses of St. Francis Xavier, show that she was thoroughly familiar with the Latin idiom, and are not unfit to rank with any translations that have been made of those glorious hymns. But the great troubles that had come upon her in Spanish, so to say, gave it such unpleasant associations that in her closing years she rarely spoke the language of the gods. "We have no Spanish ways," she wrote from Australia; "we just rose up to come here, and all Spanish ways fell off us. We sometimes talk a *leetle* Spanish at recreation, just for fun." Yet she occasionally uses Spanish in her letters, especially the word which represents the virtue she had such need of, *paciencia*.

During her last voyage, literary societies were formed by the passengers, and the captain, forgetting that all poets have not the gift of rhyme, insisted that every member should write a poem. Mother M. Evangelista, usually so bright, was on that occasion unaccountably depressed, yet her lines were the best received, though she bewails the dreariness of life, and confesses that the companions of her lonely hours are often the faded ghosts of former joys. Some of her verses are not without beauty:

"O, poor soul weary,
In exile dreary,
How is it nought around thee yields content?
Forever restless,
Like poor bird nestless,
Or spirit into alien regions sent."

Her heart turns fondly to the home of her childhood and early religious life, but she speedily lifts her eyes to heaven, where her treasure is:

“ Soul deep desiring,
Soul high aspiring,
Unto the Word lend now attentive ear,
There *is* home fairer,
There *is* joy rarer,
Than aught thou’st ever known or tasted here.”

“ Eye hath not seen it,
Ear hath not heard it,
The mind itself, with all its fancies fair,
Hath ne’er believed it,
Hath ne’er conceived it,
The faintest shadow of what waits thee there.”

The Buenos Ayres Religious continue to practice on the island-continent the virtues which spread the good odor of Jesus Christ in their former home. Nor have their labors, prayers, and sufferings been wholly fruitless in the city of good air. Religion is again asserting her rights in the Argentine Republic. And when that fair land will have ceased to be a refuge and a theatre for the lawless of other nations, posterity will hear with wonder, and not without indignation, of the pressure of strange and untoward events and circumstances which forced the Sisters of Mercy, who had come so far to assuage misery and enlighten ignorance, to appeal to the Holy Father himself to authorize their removal to a more congenial land.

God has blessed and prospered these devoted women in their Australian home. The successor¹ of the holy mother whom they still mourn is a memento of their sojourn in South America, Sister M. Clare Murphy, an Irish-Argentine (that is, born of Irish parents in the Argentine Republic), who joined the Mercy Sisterhood in Buenos Ayres in 1869.

¹ Her immediate successor was Mother M. Liguori Griffin, the same who took charge of the Lazaretto at the Argentine capital during the worst days of the yellow fever. She became ill just after the funeral of her beloved Mother Evangelista, lingered for eighteen months, and died a most holy death, April 25, 1887. Miss Griffin was daughter of Dr. Griffin, of the Jervis Street Hospital, Dublin, and was educated at Rathfarnham Abbey. She was regarded in her distant homes, Buenos Ayres and Adelaide, as an angel of charity.

INDUCTION, ANCIENT AND MODERN.

THE growth of the inductive sciences is one of the notes of modern research. The very word science, once appropriated to deductive or *a priori* knowledge, is now claimed as the exclusive property of inductive or *a posteriori* knowledge. Some of our modern treatises on Logic give far more space to inductive than to deductive Logic, and regard it as far more important. Observation and experiment take a prominence in modern systems that was quite unknown to the ancients. The laws of right observation and trustworthy experiment are examined and sifted with a carefulness of detail and a strictness of inquiry to which Aristotle and St. Thomas were wholly strangers. Laws and canons are laid down for their employment; the methods which are to regulate them are represented as the very groundwork of philosophy. The once cherished principles of the *Dictum de omni et nullo* and the *a priori* laws of thought are relegated to an unhonored obscurity. This change dates from Bacon and Locke. It does not concern us to trace its origin or the cause of its development. It is enough to say that as men turned their thoughts from laws received upon authority to those which were framed as the result of human experience, or indeed, as all authority began to be regarded as built up from below, rather than as coming down from above, it was but natural that the new constructive process should assume an importance it had never enjoyed before, and that unquestioning obedience to prevailing laws should be exchanged for a very critical inquiry into the validity and source of those laws. And when the new school of theology and philosophy had decided that they came from below, rather than from above, that they were the elected representatives of the people, rather than the appointed vicegerents of God, that they were true because everywhere of force, and not everywhere of force because true, it was but right and proper that their election should be challenged by the scientific inquirer, and that their authority should be subjected to the most approved principles of impartial and unbiased research.

Has the change been one which has strengthened truth, or one which has induced new and plausible forms of error? The answer to this question requires a very careful distinction between the various fields of knowledge. As regards things of a purely material nature and the laws that govern them, it cannot be denied that

we owe an enormous debt to the Baconian induction and its further development by subsequent writers. Nearly all our modern discoveries are due to it, and to the stimulus that it has given to the physical and mechanical sciences,—not merely to botany, chemistry, zoology; not merely to the sciences that deal with light, heat, and motion, but in the loftier tenets of medicine, hygiene, astronomy, history, ethnology, philology,—the new method has given an impulse to human activity that has changed the whole face of the world. The rapid growth of large cities, colonization, the decline in the warlike and the increase in the commercial spirit, the lower rate of mortality by reason of sanitary improvements and of the advance of medical knowledge, the decrease in crimes of violence and in lawless oppression of the poor, and many other changes, which amount to an unseen and gradual revolution, are in a great measure due to the development of the inductive method.

Yet in all this there is a counterbalancing loss which must not be overlooked. Even in the material development the gain is not unmixed; large cities have their disadvantages, and these of no mean order; the growth of a commercial spirit involves the danger of the growth of a selfish and a narrow spirit; the improvements in hygiene and medicine keep alive those who would in old times have died off in their sickly youth, and their unhealthy offspring hand on a weakly constitution in their turn to the next generation; if lawlessness has diminished, there is, on the other hand, a lower morality in the modern city than in the villages of former times, and the social critic may well be puzzled, as he weighs the advantages against the disadvantages, to say whether the effect of our material advance has on the whole been for the better or for the worse.

But there is another aspect under which we have to regard it. We have to ask whether the inductive spirit, as it is called, is calculated, on the whole, to strengthen or relax man's grasp of truth, whether the temper that has been introduced really promotes man's rational development, whether it increases or diminishes the number of important and practical principles possessed by him for the regulation of his conduct and the direction of his life to its true end, whether it is a temper that places him in his proper relation to God and teaches him the true end of his existence. We have to inquire, moreover, whether it is favorable or unfavorable to Revelation and to supernatural truth, whether its methods are suitable means to be employed by one who is looking out to discover what religion it is to which God has given His divine sanction, and outside of which all else are false and self-contradictory.

These questions will be very differently answered by those without and those within the Catholic Church. The latter, while they acknowledge the services, the enormous services rendered by the methods of modern inductive research, cannot but recognize their danger when once they are allowed to claim the almost exclusive possession of the field of truth. It is the discrediting of *a priori* truth, the knocking out of sight of the true basis of certitude, the abolition of all absolute certainty resulting from the domination of this new spirit, that alarms the Catholic. He dreads a deluge of the stream which, within proper limits and in moderate amount, would fertilize and refresh the face of the earth.

We have, therefore, to consider the relation of the ancient and modern induction, and how far we ought to give in to the claims of the latter to be the dominant method of modern logic. We will begin by glancing at the question historically, in order that we may see if there is in our two great authorities, Aristotle and St. Thomas, any recognition of modern induction and the methods by which it is safeguarded. We will then carefully examine the distinction between the induction of ancient and that of modern times, and lay down the laws and canons which regulate the one and the other. This portion of our inquiry is no unimportant one, and one, too, beset with difficulties. We have to steer our course between the Scylla of a narrow and blind indifference to the value of the new discovery, and the Charybdis of a too great devotion to a hungry monster that seeks to swallow up all truth in its rapid and all-devouring vortex.

Induction in its widest sense is, according to Aristotle, a process by which we mount up from the particular to the universal.¹ This may be done in three different ways.

i. The particulars may be the *occasion* which enables us to recognize a universal *a priori* law. They put before us in concrete form two ideas, the identity of which we might not have been able to recognize in the abstract. If we tell a man ignorant of Euclid that the exterior angle of every plane triangle is exactly equal to the two interior and remote angles, he does not instinctively recognize the truth of our statement. But if we draw first one triangle and then another, and prove it to him mathematically, he is able to mount up to the universal law. Even a single instance is sufficient to make it plain to him when once he sees that the proof is independent of the kind of triangle of which there is question, and that it holds good whether the triangle be equiangular, isosceles or scalene, obtuse-angled or right-angled or acute-angled. This, however, is scarcely induction in the strict mean-

¹ Ηπαγωγὴ ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν καθ' ἵκαστον ἐπὶ πὰ καθόλου ἔθεσσος. Ar. Tom. I. 12.

ing of the word, for the argument is rather *through* and *from* the particular instance or instances to the universal.

Induction in its strict sense is based upon the particulars, and argues *from* them, not *through* them. It is any process by which we are enabled to affirm or deny respecting the universal subject something that we have already attained or denied of the several particulars contained under it. It naturally is divided into two different kinds, which furnish us with the second and third of the various meanings of the word.

1. Complete induction, in which all the particulars are enumerated.

2. Incomplete induction, in which only a portion of the particulars are enumerated, but from this portion a conclusion is drawn which covers those not enumerated.

Complete induction, is the exact reverse of the deductive process; as in the latter we argue from the universal subject to each and all of the particulars contained under it, so in the former we argue from each and all of the particulars to the universal subject. Aristotle defines it as *proving the major term of the middle by means of the minor*, as opposed to deductive inference, which proves the major of the minor by means of the middle. For instance:

Saul, David, and Solomon were men of remarkable achievements. But Saul, David, and Solomon were all the kings of the whole of Palestine, therefore all the kings of the whole of Palestine were men of remarkable achievements; or,

Nettles, pellitories, figs, mulberries have flowers with a single perianth. But nettles, pellitories, figs, and mulberries are all the flowers belonging to the order *urticeæ*, therefore all the plants in the order *urticeæ* have flowers with a single perianth.

In these syllogisms the names of the individuals or of the lowest species are the minor term, inasmuch as they come under the class to which they immediately belong; and though collectively they are identical with it in extension, yet they have a certain inferiority to it because it is always possible that some pert historical or botanical or other discovery might add another to the list of kings who ruled over the whole of Palestine, or to the *urticeæ* plants, or to any other enumeration of particulars coming under a universal. Hence in an inductive argument middle and minor change places, or rather that which is *minor* in point of possible extension stands as the *middle* term, because in actual extension it is the equal of the middle term, which, in this kind of argument, humbly resigns its rights and takes the place of the minor term of the syllogism.

Is the inductive syllogism a legitimate one? We must look at the import of the proposition. The import of a proposition is,

that it states the existence of such a connection between the two objects of thought, that in whatever individuals you find the one you will find the other. When we apply this test to the major premiss, we find it to be a true proposition. Wherever Saul, etc., are found as objects of thought, there one shall also find remarkable achievements. But it is not similarly applicable to the minor; it is not true that wherever we find possible kings of all Israel, there we shall find Saul, etc.; it is only true in the case of the actual kings as known to us. This weak point comes out when we fix our attention on the copula. All the kings of the whole of Palestine *were* Saul, David, and Solomon, means not that the ideas of Saul, David and Solomon are present wherever the idea of king of the whole of Palestine is present as an object of thought, but merely that in point of fact the class of all the kings of the whole of Palestine is made up of these individuals. This is not the logical meaning of the copula, and at once creates the opposition between the syllogism and induction of which Aristotle speaks, and the anomaly which he mentions respecting the middle term. This, moreover, accounts for the further anomaly of a universal conclusion in figure 3, although this anomaly may be avoided by transposing the terms of the minor premiss.

Is complete induction of any practical usefulness? Yes, it has the same function as deduction. It renders implicit knowledge explicit. We are enabled to realize what we had not realized before, to trace a universal law where we had not previously suspected one. It brings out some universal characteristic of a class, or teaches us to recognize those who are bound together as members of that class, by the possession in common of a peculiarity which before we had only recognized as belonging to the individuals. It is true that this sort of induction *per enumerationem simplicem* does not establish any connection by way of cause and effect between the common property and the common class. It may be a matter of chance that all the kings who ruled the whole of Palestine were distinguished men, or that all the *urticæ* have a single perianth. But it is, at all events, a suggestive fact, and leads us to question ourselves whether there must not have been some reason why the kings in question had remarkable gifts or the flowers one perianth only.

For instance, if we go into the room of a friend, and find his library consists of ten books and ten only, and on examining them find that they are, one and all, books describing travels in China or Japan, a complete induction enables us to lay down the proposition:

All our friend's books are books of travels in China and Japan.
This suggests to us a train of thought that would never have

arisen if we had confined ourselves to the isolated fact respecting the nature of each book. Looking at them one by one, our thoughts are directed merely to the character of each and to the individual facts narrated in it. Looking at them together, we begin to think that our friend must either have been travelling in Japan or China, or that he is intending to go there, or that he must have friends in one or the other of those countries, or that he is proposing to write an article on the subject, or that for some reason or other he must have a special interest in China and in Japan.

Or, to take a historical instance : We are studying Roman history, and as we read the history of the early emperors we are disgusted at the low standard of morality prevalent among them, the cruelty, the ambition, the lust that attach to their names. We find Julius Cæsar engrossed by an insenate and unscrupulous ambition ; Augustus, a man of pleasure ; while the rest were among the vilest of manhood. This leads us to reflect, and the result of our reflection is to observe that when the empire had passed out of the hands of the Cæsars there was decided improvement. We also notice that the first two emperors were superior to the four who succeeded them, and we embody our reflection in an inductive syllogism :

Julius Cæsar, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Domitian, Nero, were men whose lives were marked by selfishness and crime ;

All the Cæsars who ruled the Roman Empire were Julius Cæsar, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Domitian, Nero :

Therefore all the Cæsars who ruled the Roman Empire were men whose lives were marked by selfishness and crime.

The conclusion of this syllogism naturally leads us to ask whether there must not be some influence tending to deteriorate the character in the position of emperor of Rome, and further, whether that influence is a universal one, or is limited to this family, whose members appear to have been specially affected by it. This gives occasion to an interesting train of thought, which would never have been suggested had we not mentally gone through our process of complete induction.

The weak point of a complete induction is that in so many cases we are not perfectly sure that it is complete. We fancy that we have not overlooked any one of the particulars, whence we argue to the universal law, while all the time there is one that for some reason has escaped our notice, and perhaps this very one is fatal to the universality of our law. In the case of the Roman emperors it is always possible that there might have intervened between the reign of one emperor and the next recorded a short space of time during which there reigned some emperor whom historians never knew of, or for some reason or other passed over in silence. We may practically feel certain that this is not the case, but we never

can have that perfect certainty that leaves no room for any possible doubt. Or, to take a more practical case. Let us suppose chemists arguing a century ago about the then known metals:

Iron, copper, silver, gold, lead, zinc, tin, mercury, antimony, bismuth, nickel, platinum and aluminium are all heavier than water;

Iron, copper, silver, gold, lead, etc., are all the metals;

Therefore all the metals are heavier than water.

Here would be a complete induction of the metals then known, but nevertheless the conclusion would be false. Since that time potassium, sodium, and lithium have been pronounced to be metals, and all these are lighter than water.

Of course there are some cases where an enumeration is perfectly secure of completeness, *e.g.*, if we argue that January, February, etc., have all twenty-eight days or more, we cannot be wrong in concluding that *all* the months of the year have twenty-eight days or more. From the fact that Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, etc., are named after some heathen deity, we conclude that all the days of the week derive their names from heathen deities. But this is merely accidental and comparatively rare.

2. We now come to incomplete or material induction.

Incomplete induction is recognized by Aristotle, though he does not say very much respecting it. It comes under his definition of induction as "a process from particulars to universals," and the instance he gives is an instance of material and complete induction.

Pilots, charioteers, etc., who know their business are most skilful.

Therefore, generally, all who know their business are most skilful.

Further, he describes it as more persuasive and clearer, and more capable of being arrived at by perception and within the reach of the masses, while the syllogism is more forcible and clearer as an answer to gainsayers.

Here it is evident that he is speaking of an argument from a limited number of instances to the whole class. He describes the object of induction as being to *persuade* rather than to *convince*; as being *clearer* in the eyes of ordinary men, inasmuch as it appeals to their sensible experience; as more within their reach, since it is an argument that all can appreciate; whereas the argument that starts from first principles implies a grasp of such principles, and this is comparatively rare among the mass of men. Yet it has not the compelling force of deductive reasoning inasmuch as it can always be evaded; it is not in itself so clear as the syllogism; it does not hit home with the same irresistible force as the argument that makes its unbroken way from the first principles that none can deny to the conclusion which we seek to establish. All this is exactly applicable to material induction, and would have little or no force if he were speaking of formal or complete induction.

The example, moreover, that he gives is so incomplete as scarcely to deserve the name of induction at all. He merely takes two instances of the arts, and from them at once draws the conclusion that in all the arts science and success are inseparable. Possibly he chooses this extreme instance to show how very imperfect an induction may be sufficient to establish a general law where that law has the constant and universal testimony of mankind in its favor; and that men need only to be reminded of the law by the instances adduced rather than to be taught any fresh truth from an examination of the invariable coexistence of the two objects of thought which the instances exhibited as invariably united.

But Aristotle's brief reference to induction is a remarkable contrast to the elaborate treatment of it by modern writers on logic. St. Thomas, and the scholastic logicians generally, are equally concise in their discussion of it. Even the Catholic logicians of the present day pass it over in a few paragraphs or a few pages, which are devoted in part to an attack on Baconian induction and to an assertion that induction has no force unless it can be reduced to syllogistic form. Sir W. Hamilton, Mansel, and the Scottish school of philosophers are at one with the schoolmen and modern Catholic writers in their jealousy of the intrusion of induction, and, though they do not agree with them in advocating the necessity of reducing it to the form of the syllogism, yet they would assign to it a very subordinate place in a treatise on logic. It is the modern school of experimentalists, of whom John Stuart Mill is the illustrious leader, who put forward induction as "the main question of the science of logic, the question that includes all others." This suggests to us these questions:

1. How far does material induction come into logic at all?
2. Is it true that all induction must be capable of being reduced to a syllogistic form in order to be valid?
3. Is the neglect of induction by modern Catholic writers to be praised or blamed?

We are speaking here of *material* or *incomplete* induction, and unless we warn our readers to the contrary, we shall continue to use it in this sense to the end of our present chapter.

Induction, says Cardinal Zigliara, has no force whatever apart from the syllogism. Incomplete induction, says Tongiorgi, is not a form of argument different from the syllogism. Induction, says Mendive (*Logica*, p. 224), is a true form of reasoning, and it pertains to the essence of reasoning that it should be a true syllogism. Induction, says Liberatore (*Logic*, p. 90), does not differ in its essence, but only in the form it takes, from the syllogism. Yet we have seen that when reduced to syllogistic form it breaks the rules of the syllogism and uses the copula in an altogether differ-

ent meaning. How, then, are we to solve the difficulty? As usual, we have to examine carefully into our use of terms. *Syllogism* is an ambiguous term. There is the *deductive syllogism*, with its figures and moods, such as we have described them above, and which is subject to and based upon the *dictum de omni et nullo*. Whatever may be affirmed or denied of a universal subject, may be affirmed or denied of each and all the individuals that are included under that subject. In this sense induction is outside the syllogism, and any attempt to reduce it to syllogistic form at once exhibits a violation of syllogistic laws. But besides the deductive syllogism the word syllogism is used in a wider sense for any process of reasoning based on a more general principle, viz., wherever two objects of thought are identical with a third, they are also identical with each other. This principle includes not only the deductive syllogism, but the inductive syllogism also.

Induction, therefore, comes into logic as reducible to syllogistic form, but not to the form of the deductive syllogism. This is true of both complete and incomplete induction when we argue:

James I. and II., Charles I. and II. were headstrong monarchs;
James I. and II., Charles I and II. were all the monarchs of the Stuart dynasty;

Therefore all the monarchs of the Stuart dynasty were headstrong.

We violate one of the rules of the third figure by our universal conclusion. We use the copula, not for the necessary coexistence of two objects of thought, since it is conceivable that a future Stuart might arise and falsify our minor, but for the fact which is true in the concrete. Our argument, moreover, refuses to obey the authority of the *dictum de omni et nullo*, and is therefore no true form of the inductive syllogism.

But our argument is a perfectly valid syllogism in that it is in accordance with the principles of identity we have just given; it is in accordance with the laws of thought and is perfectly logical. But is this true of *incomplete induction*? For instance: We argue from the fact that we have observed on a number of separate days to all possible days in the year. We have noticed that all the days when there has been a gradual fall in the barometer have been followed by rain, and we state the result of our observation in the following premisses:

January 18, March 4, April 7, October 19, were succeeded by rainy weather;

January 18, March 4, April 7, October 19, were days on which there was a fall of the barometer;

Therefore all the days on which there is a fall of the barometer are days followed by rainy weather.

In order that the conclusion may hold good in strict logic, we must be able to assert that January 18, March 4, April 7, October 19, are all the days when there was a fall in the barometer, and this is obviously ridiculous. But may we not put our minor in another form, and say:

What is true of January 18, March 4, April 7, October 19, is true of all days when the barometer falls;

Rain near at hand is true of January 18, March 4, April 7, October 19, therefore, rain near at hand is true of all the days on which the barometer falls. Everything, therefore, depends on the representative character of January 18, March 4, April 7, October 19. If they have nothing in common save this one feature of the fall of the barometer which can be connected with the coming change in the weather, then no one can deny that there must be some sort of connection between a fall in the barometer and rainy weather near at hand, which will justify us in predicting of days on which the barometer falls that they will be succeeded by rain.

But before we enter on an investigation of this point, there is a previous question. Does it concern us as logicians to investigate it at all? Is it within our scope to examine into the various instances in order to sift their value as evidence? Has not the logician to assume his principles as true, supposing always that they contain nothing which violates the laws of the human mind and of right reason, or is he to employ the various methods of observation and experiment by which the truth of all *a posteriori* and synthetical propositions have to be tested? If these lie outside the province of logic, the moderns are not only one-sided and unfair in giving so large a space to induction, but are all wrong in their very conception of the task they have to perform.

This question can only be satisfactorily answered by reminding the reader of the distinction between *formal* and *material* (or applied) logic. Formal logic simply takes its premisses for granted as long as they do not sin against any law of thought or contradict any proposition of the truth of which we are absolutely certain. Applied logic steps outside this comparatively narrow field, and asks what the terms are which regulate our admission into the mind of any proposition as a part of our mental furniture. Formal logic, therefore, has nothing to do with the conditions under which we can arrive at universal propositions other than those to which we are compelled by the nature of the mind itself. It has nothing to do with those propositions which we are led to regard as true by reason of what we witness in the external world, and which depend upon laws learned by observation and not rooted in as *a priori* conditions of thought. It has nothing to do with arriving at those *a posteriori* truths.

Observation and experiment, therefore, are wholly outside the province of formal logic. The only question is, whether they have any claim to consideration under the head of applied logic; whether as means of adding to the propositions that we regard as *certain* and adopt as such, they should be examined into, and the results to which they lead tested. As to their other qualifications for admission into the mind, this depends on a further question. Do the various methods which were first inaugurated by Bacon and subsequently developed by those who have followed in his steps give us certainty at all, and if so, what sort of certainty?

Probably no one in his senses will deny that external observation can give us certainty. That the sun will rise to-morrow morning, that a stone thrown into the air will fall to earth again, are as certain as anything can be that does not depend on the inner laws that regulate all being. But such a certainty is, strictly speaking, always a practical or hypothetical, never an essential or absolute certainty. It is within the bounds of absolute possibility. But some unknown comet might intervene between the earth and the sun during the coming night, or, some undiscovered and mysterious influence might whisk away our stone to the moon, not to mention the further possibility of Divine interference by what we call a miracle.

But in the case of *a priori* laws no miracle can intervene, no possible hypothesis can set them aside. God Himself cannot make five out of two and two, or prevent things equal to the same thing from being equal to one another, or cause the exterior angle of any plane triangle to be less than either of the interior and opposite angles. It is beyond the utmost limit of Divine omnipotence to bring about either of these, because they are in themselves contradictory, and would, if they could be realized, make God a liar. These *a priori* laws are not merely laws of thought and of human reason, but of being and of the Divine nature. They are based upon the nature of God Himself, and thus on Eternal and Immutable Truth.

Not so the physical laws at which we arrive by observation and experiment. God could reverse them all to-morrow, if He chose. He does, from time to time, intervene and hinder their efficacy. They are not founded on the Divine nature, but in the Divine enactment. They are, therefore, liable to exceptions, and this is why we say that they have only a hypothetical or conditional certainty.

But they have another source of weakness. Not only can God set them aside at any moment if He pleases, but we are not *absolutely* certain that they exist at all. All that we call physical laws

are but magnificent hypotheses. We have not the means of arriving at any absolute certainty when once we depart from those laws which are stamped on all being, and therefore on the human intellect, which are the very conditions under which we think, because the conditions under which all things, even God Himself, necessarily exist. When we come to laws that are purely *a posteriori*, we never can say more than that they are generalizations from experience, that they explain all the facts known to us, and that they satisfy every test we can apply to them. Such is the law of gravity, the undulatory theory of light, the laws of attraction and distance, etc. All this gives us physical certainty respecting them, but this is utterly inferior to absolute certainty. It is the attainment of physical certainty which is regulated by the various methods that have come in since the time of Bacon, and it cannot be denied that these methods were an object of comparative indifference and neglect to scholastic and Aristotelian philosophy. The pre-Reformation world did not recognize the importance of those modern discoveries and inventions which have revolutionized the world since the days of Bacon. With the Aristotelian philosophy dominant, the steam-engine, gas, the electric light, steam-looms, sewing-machines, and all the mechanical substitutes for human labor would either not have existed at all, or never arrived at their present perfection. The *a priori* method had no room for hypothesis, and hypothesis is the fertile mother of physical research and discovery. Whether all those have really fostered human progress, whether they have made men stronger, healthier, more honest, virtuous, and happy, is a point which does not concern us. We have already wandered too far away from the question before us, which is this: Are we to admit into logic, in its wider sense, what are called the *inductive methods*, and which are elaborated with wonderful skill and ability by John Stuart Mill?

Among the functions of natural or applied logic, one of the most important is to distinguish between certitude and probability, and also to separate the various kinds of certitude one from the other. But when once we have passed from the highest kind of certitude to a lower level, from metaphysical to physical certitude, it does not belong to the logician to elaborate with minute care the various conditions necessary for attaining to the latter. It would be misleading for him to dwell on them with too much detail; it would have a tendency to raise in the estimation of mankind the laws that are based on them to an equality with the *a priori* laws; to exalt hypothesis into law, to lead men to confound practical with absolute certainty, to obliterate the distinction between the eternal, the immutable, and the transitory, the contingent, the mutable. Yet in spite of all this, they cannot be passed over, and ought not

to be passed over unnoticed, in the present day. They are too important a factor in the present condition of human society to admit of our neglecting them; they are weapons which have been forged by what is called the march of human intellect, and it would be suicidal to deny their value and their efficacy. Besides, we ought to master them in order to protest against their abuse. We must give them their due in order that they may not usurp the whole field of human science. Mill and his followers drag down all the *a priori* laws to the level of the *a posteriori*, or rather deny the existence of *a priori* laws at all. This is the fatal result of the departure from the old scholastic method, which began at the "Reformation," and has been carried farther, day by day. But, *fas est et ab hoste doceri*; and the various methods set forth in detail by Mill have, in their own proper limits, a most important function to perform, and are of constant application to our everyday life.

We have now to return to our consideration of the premises which assert the representative nature of the instances on which we are going to base our law. Our methods are to give us the means of ascertaining this. They are to decide for us whether what is true of the instances under our consideration is true of all instances, real or possible; or, at least, they are to settle the question for us as far as it is possible in the nature of things to arrive at any certainty respecting it.

Our premisses then asserted that what was true of January 14th, etc., is true of all days on which the barometer falls, and the value of our argument depends on our being able to establish this proposition. What is necessary to prove it satisfactorily is to show that these days had nothing in common which could possibly be connected with the approach of rainy weather, save a certain heaviness in the air indicated by the fall in the barometer. If this could be ascertained beyond a doubt, then we should have a perfect physical certainty that there was a connection of cause and effect between the heaviness in the air and the subsequent rain. But in point of fact we never can be sure that there are not other characteristics common to these days which might be the source of the phenomenon of rain. To be absolutely certain would require a knowledge of the inner nature of things, which even the greatest scientist does not possess. All that we can say is, that we are unable to detect any common characteristic in the days in question which would account for the subsequent rain, save only the heaviness in the air and the consequent fall of the barometer, and therefore the connection between the rain and the heaviness in the air is at most but a strong probability.

Here, then, we have a case of the first of Mr. Mill's experimental methods, the *Method of Agreement*. We cannot do better than formulate it in his own words: If two or more instances of the phenomenon under investigation have only one circumstance in common, the circumstance in which alone all the instances agree is the cause (or effect) of the given phenomenon.

Our readers will observe that in this law Mr. Mill goes beyond the requirements we have given above, and exacts not only the presence of no common circumstance which could account for the result save one, but absolutely the presence of no common circumstance at all save one alone. To establish this will be still more impossible, therefore we can derive from the employment of this method nothing more than a strong probability. There are no two phenomena in the world which have not one common circumstance.

But there is another method which comes in to supplement the former. Let us suppose that we find a day exactly corresponding to one of the days aforesigned in every circumstance save one, viz., the weight of the air. In all else they are exactly alike. When we examine the rain record of the year we find that on the day when the air was heavy rain followed, and on the day when it was light fine weather came after it. Here too we should again have perfect physical certainty, if only we could find two days corresponding exactly in every possible circumstance save one. There would be no doubt whatever as to the connection of the circumstance with the result that was present when the circumstance in question was present, absent when the circumstance was absent. But here, too, it is impossible to find any two such days; there must of necessity be a dozen points of difference between the two. All that we can have is a certain amount of correspondence, and the absence of any points of difference which seem likely to be connected with the result, save the single circumstance which is conspicuous for its presence in the one case and for its absence in the other. Here, therefore, we are again limited to a probable connection and can get no further.

In this case we have an instance of the *Method of Difference*; we will again give it in Mr. Mill's own words:

"If an instance in which the phenomenon under investigation occurs and another in which it does not occur have every circumstance in common save one, that one occurring only in the former, the circumstance in which alone the two instances differ, is the effect, or the cause, or an indispensable part of the cause of the phenomenon."

But this second method, as Mr. Mill very pertinently remarks, is applicable rather to experiment than to observation, that is, to

cases where we can artificially vary the antecedents instead of having to receive them ready made. We will, therefore, take another instance, which will moreover have the advantage of illustrating other methods of inductive research which cannot be so easily applied to the case of the weather.

We will take a familiar and very practical case: We have of late from time to time risen with a headache in the morning for which we cannot account. Somehow we fancy it must be connected with some sort of digestive disarrangement and that this disarrangement is the result of some food that we have taken and that does not suit our stomach. One day it occurs to us that our headache always follows upon a special dish, and that possibly this might be its cause. We therefore take note of what we have for dinner, and after a little experience we discover that in most cases when we have eaten of jugged hare for dinner, we have had a headache the next morning. We set to work to test the connection by means of the methods of agreement and difference. First of all, we take a number of days when our dinner has been as varied as possible; on one day we have taken soup, on another day not; on one day we have had beef for the chief dish, on another mutton, on another veal, and on another pork. On one day we have drunk port wine, on another sherry, on another hock, on another champagne, on another claret, on another nothing but water. On one day we have partaken of pastry, on another not; on one day cheese, on another not, and so on *ad infinitum*, varying our dinner in every possible way on the days of trial. But on all these days there has been the common element of jugged hare, and on each of them there has been a headache following. Here we have a good instance of the method of agreement.

But we cannot be certain that there may not have been some other cause for our headache which happened to coincide with the jugged hare. We may have been rather tired on the evenings in question, or, perhaps, a little more thirsty than usual, and the port wine may have been more attractive than on other days. So we proceed to a further experiment. On two given days we take the same amount of exercise, and order exactly the same dinner, drink the same amount of wine and go to bed at the same hour. The only difference between these two days is that on the former we make jugged hare an item in our bill of fare, and on the other omit it. The result is that the former day is followed by a severe headache, whereas after the latter we rise fresh and ready for business.

Here we have the method of difference. At first the experiment seems decisive, but it is not so. It may be the mere addition of

quantity involved in the presence of the jugged hare that is the cause of the headache, or perchance on the day we ate of it the wind was in the east, or our stomach was already out of order, or some unwonted worry had befallen us. We, therefore, are still in the region of probabilities. Can we ever escape from them? We can do a good deal towards it by means of a third method, which is often extremely useful.

We resolve on a new experiment. We determine that we will try the effect of eating on one day a very small portion of jugged hare at our dinner, on another of having a good deal more, on another of making it the chief part of our dinner, and on another of having no other meat dish at all. The result is that we find that the severity of our headache is exactly or almost exactly proportioned to the amount of jugged hare eaten on the previous evening; a small quantity produced a very slight headache, a large quantity a more serious one, while on the morning following the day when we ate nothing else than hare we were so wretchedly ill that we were unable to attend to our ordinary business. Here is what is generally known as the *method of concomitant variations*.

Whatever phenomenon varies in any manner whenever another phenomenon varies in some particular manner, is either a cause or an effect of that phenomenon, or is connected with it through some fact of causation.

We are now approaching certainty, but there is nevertheless a possible element of uncertainty arising from the chance of the varying headache having been owing to circumstances which by a curious coincidence happened to produce it, with a severity which quite by accident was in proportion to the amount of jugged hare eaten for dinner. We are still in the region of probabilities, and we look round for a final method to try and assure the truth of our inference.

We have for years been studying the effects of various sorts of food and drink, as well as of walking, hard study, riding, boating, etc., on our constitution. Long experience has taught us the effect of each of these. Beef and mutton make us rather heavy the next morning, so does port wine; champagne makes us rise well contented with ourselves, plum pudding produces indigestion; walking, riding, cricket, and boating produce different kinds of bodily fatigue; severe mental labor, a curious feeling of oppression on the top of our head, and so on. On some particular morning we take stock of our bodily condition, and its various constituent symptoms. We are able to trace each and all of them to some familiar antecedent—all except the headache—we can trace in our present state of body the result of most of the circumstances of the previous day, the mental and bodily labor, the various kinds

of food, the amount of sleep, each has its familiar result—all save the jugged hare. Hence we subduct from the various results all those we can trace to known causes, and (neglecting minor details) we have left on the one hand the headache and on the other the jugged hare. Surely, then, this result unaccounted for must spring from the cause not yet taken into consideration. This method, which can often be employed with great advantage, is called the method of residues. Mr. Mill formulates it into the following law:

Deduct from any phenomenon such part as is known by previous induction to be the effect of certain antecedents, and the residue of the phenomenon is the effect of the remaining antecedent.

Does this give us perfect physical certainty? Most decidedly not, if one take it by itself. Our attribution of effect *a* to cause *A*, of *b* to *B*, etc., is at best only a probable argument, and even if it is all correct, we cannot be sure that we have exhausted either consequents or possible antecedents. At most this method only contributes its share to the ever-increasing stream of probability which is gradually developing itself into the resistless river of practical certainty.

But when all these methods are united together, surely then we have certainty; not metaphysical certainty, but at least practical and physical certainty. Surely we can go beyond the mere tentative assertion of a hypothesis to the firm conviction of a well-grounded law which certainly connects together the circumstances we are considering as cause and effect, or at least as in some way connected together by a final and stable law of causation.

Here we enter on a wider topic which would be out of place in the present paper. To those who still hold to *a priori* truths, to the school of Aristotle and St. Thomas, there opens out an endless vista of causes and effects, descending from God, the first cause, to every detail of His works, each connected together by a law which He has decreed, but which He may at any time set aside at His good pleasure, and which He has set aside from time to time by what we call a miracle.

But to the modern school of sensationalists, to Mill and Bain, cause and effect are words which have no meaning. *Cause* is but an invariable, unconditional antecedent, and effect an invariable, unconditional consequent. In them, if they were logical, there would be no certainty about the future, for what possible reason is there why it should resemble the past? Because it has always done so? The very supposition is a contradiction in terms, for the future is still unborn. All that experience has taught them is that one portion of the past has hitherto resembled another, that there has always been an unbroken uniformity of succession in the series

of antecedents and consequents. But of the future as such we never have had and never can have any experience, and our conjectures respecting it are, if we logically follow to their conclusions the theories of Mr. Mill and his school, the merest guess-work, an arrow shot into the air without any sort of ground for believing that it will hit the mark.

Our conclusion, therefore, is that these methods are a most valuable contribution, if not to logic, strictly so called, yet to the course of human discovery and scientific research. The Catholic philosopher learns from Aristotle and St. Thomas the *a priori* law, one of the first principles of all knowledge, that every effect must have a cause. He knows that this law extends not merely to effects following as particular applications of some *a priori* law which becomes known to us as soon as a single instance of it is presented before us and grasped by our intelligence, as in the case of the deductions and inferences of mathematics, but also to effects following from what is also rightly called a law, inasmuch as it is a general principle, under which a vast number of particulars are ranged, but is nevertheless arrived at by generalization from a vast number of particular instances. In the one case, as in the other, the universal law of causation holds. In the one case cause is joined to effect in virtue of the inner nature of things; in the other simply because the will of God has so disposed the arrangements of the universe that He has created. In the one case experience makes known to us a law which is already imprinted on our intelligence; in the other experience makes known to us a law which is stamped upon the world outside, but only becomes a part of our mental furniture when we have carefully weighed and sifted a number of individual instances of its operation. In the one case the methods of induction are rarely, if ever, of any practical use; in the other they are simply invaluable.

We are now in a position to assign their true place to the inductive methods of which Bacon was the harbinger and Mr. John Stuart Mill and his school the prophets and apostles.

1. They certainly can claim a place in material logic, even if not in formal. To ignore them and to hurry over material induction with a passing remark that it must be virtually complete, *i.e.*, must include a number of instances sufficient to afford a reasonable basis of certitude, is scarcely prudent in the face of the development of scientific research. Catholics would not be so easily taken in by the hasty generalizations of the modern scientist if they had the use of these methods and the kind of certainty to be derived from them at their fingers' ends. It is no use to allege the authority of Aristotle and St. Thomas in disparagement of them. If Aristotle and St. Thomas had lived in the present day they would have

taken the lead in regulating the methods of scientific research, just as in their own day they laid down the principles of deductive argument. The eager questioning of nature was in their day a thing unheard of, and any elaborate setting forth of the methods to be pursued was then superfluous and unnecessary.

2. These inductive methods can never give us *absolute* certainty, but they can give us *physical* certainty. They cannot give us absolute certainty because the laws they reveal to us are reversible at the will of their maker; they can give us physical certainty for the simple reason that the human mind is so constructed as to be able to test without any reasonable doubt, on a combination of arguments of which it may be that no single and individual one is sufficient to carry conviction to the mind of a reasonable man, but a number of them combined is enough and more than enough to make him perfectly sure of the conclusion to which they one and all concurrently point.

3. We must always be on our guard against allowing ourselves to be persuaded into a conviction of the truth of some general hypothesis when the concurrent evidence is not sufficient of itself to produce conviction. We must remember Aristotle's admirable distinction between deduction and induction, that the one is more forcible, the other more persuasive and clear, and within the reach of ordinary men.

4. We have too often seen the intellectual convictions of scientific men shaken by the brilliant guesses which induction suggests, and which they regarded as justifying them in discarding the belief that they had previously held to be true. Very slow and cautious should we be in allowing any law arrived at by a process of pure induction to set aside any conviction that seems to be based upon a higher and more certain mode of argument. Of course there are occasional instances, as the so-often quoted case of Galileo; but for one such instance there have been hundreds in which some premature hypothesis has been allowed to weaken the grasp on a *priori* truth, to be in its turn discarded for some equally premature successor, sitting in its turn for a brief period on the usurped throne of truth.

THE BATTLE WITH ANTICHRIST IN FRANCE.

THE year '88 is passing slowly away in "The Land of the Lilies," and the centenary of '89 approaches, bringing with it the dread memories of the great French Revolution. Already the men who, in France, consider themselves to be the heirs of the "Principles of 1789," are commemorating, one after the other, the chief events which, in 1788, startled all Europe, as the first throes of an earthquake give warning of some mighty and far-spreading upheaval. Those, on the contrary, whose deepest convictions lead them to uphold and defend the ancient Christian order of society, assailed and partly destroyed by the Revolution, are roused into extraordinary activity and united effort to protect the institutions and doctrines which they hold to be most sacred and most dear. They have, in truth, great need of perfect union and concerted action. For ANTICHRIST is abroad in France, marshalling his forces under his own flag, held boldly on high in sight of the nations. The battle-cry of his soldiers—a countless host, and bent this time on completing their work of destruction—is directed against GOD AND HIS CHRIST. The pass-word of Voltaire to his followers a century ago, *Erasez l'Infâme*, has now become *Ni Dieu ni Maître*—NO GOD, NO MASTER!

The conflict has been going on for some time between the two hosts. The successive measures taken by the various administrations under the new Republic, ever since the downfall of Marshal MacMahon and the election to the presidency of M. Grévy, have been so many victories of Antichrist, all carrying forward the grand purpose of "laicizing," that is, of DECHRISTIANIZING, in France, not only the entire field of education, but every department of public charity and beneficence, of excluding all religious emblems, practices and influences from every establishment under Government control; hospitals, prisons, the army and the navy, counting at the present moment nearly two millions of men in active or occasional service.

After all that has been effectually done in France toward the accomplishment of this grand scheme of "dechristianizing" the nation, it will be natural to describe what those in power are planning further to do to make their work complete; this will place before the reader the plan of campaign marked out for the anti-Christian forces during the decisive year 1889. We shall then review some at least of the forces which are bravely battling for

Christ, and struggling with a heroism, a skill, a success worthy of all admiration, against the fearful odds they have to contend with.

This study of the two adverse hosts will enable us to forecast, under God's good providence, the destiny of the kingdom of St. Louis at the close of the nineteenth and the opening of the twentieth century of the Christian era.

I.

Should any reader be startled by the heading of this article, or be disposed to question the anti-Christian character of the warfare made on the entire social order in France by the men of 1789, and which their successors are determined to carry on to ultimate and complete victory in 1889, then let him peruse the facts which we here submit to his judgment.

De Tocqueville, whose earlier works betrayed the influence of the false liberalism prevailing among his contemporaries, formed, in the light of his riper experience, a truer estimate of things. We may trust to his having studied conscientiously and judged fairly the principles and tendencies dominant in France a hundred years ago.

"One of the first steps taken by the French Revolution," he says in his latest work, *l'Ancien Régime et la Révolution*, "was to assail the Church, and, among the passions sprung from that revolution, the first which blazed forth and the last to be extinguished was the anti-religious passion. Napoleon, who had been able to put down the liberal genius of the French Revolution, vainly endeavored to conquer its anti-Christian genius. Even in our own times we have known men who thought they atoned for their servility toward the lowest agents of the political power by their insolence toward God; and who, while giving up whatever was most liberal, most noble, and most elevating in the doctrines of the Revolution, fancied that they were true to its spirit because they persisted in being unbelievers."

That the anti-Christian passion, which was, indeed, "the first to blaze forth" at the beginning of the Revolution, was also the "last to be extinguished," or ever extinguished at all, we shall see presently. It is only stating what is simple historical truth when we say that this intense passion, after having exhausted its fierceness during the last twelve years of the eighteenth century in destruction, bloodshed and persecution, slumbered on, like the flames of Etna, with occasional outbursts, till the great eruption in 1880-81, under the Ferry-Bert ministry. And to this outbreak of the unsparing and devastating "dechristianizing" spirit has succeeded a fresh and no less violent eruption in 1888, which is itself only

prophetic of something still more fearful during the centennial celebration of next year.

President Grévy and his unscrupulous son-in-law, Daniel Wilson, were, in all conscience, sufficiently devoted to such republicanism as European Freemasons are capable of understanding or tolerating. But, like Gambetta, who was cut off by a decree of the occult force governing France at present, poor old Grévy had still some lingering traditional reverence for the social order and institutions of the past. The dishonest speculations in which his son-in-law indulged were only a pretext for rudely unseating the President. And in his place was chosen a man whose very name and well-known principles are a guarantee that he will do his utmost to complete in 1889 the revolutionary work begun in 1789.

Then the very ministry which has just come into power, the Floquet-Lockroy ministry, are, like the President of the Republic himself, the avowed heirs of the anti-Christian conspirators in the States-General of 1789, who destroyed the ancient constitution of France, and, for a time at least, utterly overturned the entire social order created there by Christianity. What their ancestors and predecessors did not succeed in accomplishing permanently, they are now resolved and pledged to do: to blot out from France, once and for all time, the very last remnants of all religious institutions; to pluck up by the roots, from the mind, the heart, the public and private life of France, the faith in Christ the Redeemer, the belief in God and in the life to come.

They are pledged to do this. The very conclusion of the first ministerial programme was a solemn promise to the extreme radicals and revolutionists in both houses of Parliament that the policy of the Government should be "to steer (the vessel of State) ever more and more in the direction of the Left," that is, the revolutionary party.

There can be thus no possibility of mistaking the one great and immediate purpose of these revolutionists,—namely, to carry forward the anti-Christian and anti-social revolution, begun a century ago, to the extremities contemplated by the Jacobins of that period and sworn to by those of to-day.

Leo XIII., in that magnificent Encyclical, *Humanum genus*, described the great conspiracy against Christian civilization entered into in the days of our great-grandfathers by Illuminism and Masonry. As was said of Voltaire, the mouthpiece and tool of these conspirators, who died on the eve of the French Revolution, that "he did not live to see the widespread destruction his principles and his disciples had wrought"; so we may say of the conspirators and Jacobins of 1788: "They have not lived to see what

we see; but they are the authors of the mighty changes we behold."

Let us now study the plan of campaign just adopted by the Republican Union, composed of all the avowed revolutionists, socialists and communists inside and outside of the French Parliament.

On the evening of May 23d, 1888, there met by appointment at the Grand Orient, in the *Rue Cadet*, 430 Freemasons, senators, members of the Chamber of Deputies, of the Paris Municipal Council, and other leading political personages. The initiative in calling this meeting was taken by M. Clémenceau, the acknowledged leader of the extreme Radical Left, by M. Jefferin, the standard bearer of the Socialists, and by M. Ranc, the spokesman of the Opportunists or Gambetta Republicans.

The meeting resolved itself into what is henceforth to become historical as *La Société des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen*. In their preliminary declaration, after saying that their immediate object is to defeat the "Boulanger adventure, so humiliating for the country," they affirm that they also are in favor of a revision of the Constitution. "We are the sons of the French Revolution," they say; "we are the admirers of this Revolution, not as considered at any one of its phases, but of the entire movement forward of a free people who undertook to solve every problem, and would have succeeded therein had they not been stopped in their march. We are, therefore, determined to make use of every means in order to prevent a Cæsaristic reaction to throw our country back for the third time.

"A revision of the Constitution is needed; but it must be a Republican revision, not the Bonapartist revision, demanded as an expedient by those who have set on foot the new plebiscitary movement for the sole purpose of establishing a one-man power.

"But this revision alone is not sufficient. *We must take up where it stopped the national movement of the French Revolution, and become its continuators.*"

We italicize this pregnant sentence to fix attention on the real aim of the men who are now all-powerful in France, and are likely to so continue for some years to come. We shall see presently what is the precise nature of the "interrupted work" which the revolutionary heirs of 1789-99 undertake to carry forward to its ultimate perfection. Only let the reader not be deceived by the fine words he is about to read: *freedom* and *right* and *conscience* mean for us American freemen things entirely different from what is in the mind and in the heart of a French radical and revolutionist.

"We must protect," they continue, "individual liberties and

public liberties, the liberties pertaining to the propagation of doctrines, to the press, to meetings, to associating, all guaranteed under the republican system.

"We must carry on the development of the Republic in its entirety, that is, to realize progressively all the constitutional, political and social reforms thereby implied.

"To the threatened attempts to set up a dictatorship we must oppose the maintenance of the rights of manhood and citizenship proclaimed by the Revolution.

"Such is our purpose.

"We find an instrument for effecting it in our Republican tradition, in the restoration of the great political associations which, by grouping together all the democratic forces of Paris and the departments, were the stimulating energy of the Revolutionary assemblies.

"We hereby found the Society of the Rights of Man and the Citizen.

"Its object is to defend the Republic by combating without mercy every attempt in favor of reaction or a dictatorship."

Then the by-laws of the Society were read by M. Clémenceau, and three representative men delivered addresses, two of whom were leading members of the Paris Municipal Council, known to be Autonomists or Communards.

As one of the most influential of the morning journals remarks, "thus is created a vast organization destined to spread all over France."

The permanent executive committee of twenty-nine members, appointed to act in the name of the new society, foreshadows, unless we are much mistaken, one of the most powerful and energetic instruments ever devised by Jacobinism.

Now let us see what is to be the "animating and governing spirit" of this formidable organization. As, during the last few months, efforts have been made by M. Laguerre, the chief supporter of General Boulanger, to enlist in favor of the latter, not only the Masonic lodge of which M. Laguerre is the head, but as many as possible of the countless lodges covering France like a net-work, counter efforts have been made to secure for the Floquet ministry the support of French Masonry; and how far M. Floquet or his friends have succeeded in this we shall now see.

Some days before, and in advance of the important meeting above referred to, the heads of the principal Masonic lodges of Paris and its neighborhood met at the Grand Orient and decided to hold, in Paris, on Sunday, June 3d, at 2 P.M., a congress of French Masons. This assemblage is also called together for the ostensible purpose of counteracting the Boulanger movement.

One of the organs of the sect, *Le Mot d'Odre*, publishes an editorial on the subject, with the heading, "The Masonic Action," which deserves to be attentively read by all who still cherish any affection for the Christian social order under which their forefathers lived.

"This awakening, this transformation of Freemasonry," so the editor writes, "which, after the night of the Napoleonic empire, had some difficulty in coming into the light of day, had been preceded by an interior movement which, although not much observed in its details, is not the less real in its main results. For some time previously Freemasonry manifested a tendency toward freeing itself from traditional customs, respectable indeed in themselves, but repellent to a number of serious-minded men,—a tendency to aim at something higher than the appearing to be a mysterious society with a fantastic ritual and fearful ceremonies. . . ."

We all know at present that besides doing away with these ridiculous forms of initiation, etc., French Masonry abjured everything which bore any trace of a religious ceremonial, anything that could bear the construction of a belief in God.

"Freemasonry," the article goes on to say, "is, therefore, no longer that excessively traditionalistic institution in the eyes of some people, that somewhat laughable institution to the mind of others. An outsider could no longer embarrass a Mason by asking for a little *curaçoa* mixed up in the Hiram bitters, since the cup of bitterness is alone generally presented to adepts in our day."

"We are organizing a great Masonic congress for the first Sunday of June in Paris. It will be an imposing manifestation, not only by its numbers, but because, as a republican demonstration, it will make a great noise throughout the country. The very numerous adhesions to the policy of M. Floquet's ministry, sent in by the Lodges from all parts of France, can leave no room for doubting as to what spirit will preside over this congress.

"Masonic action is, just at this moment, one of the surest and most lawful means of defending ourselves and to prepare for truly republican elections. Let us not permit this weapon to rust or to get ruined by contempt, or ridicule, or ignorance."

Placed side by side with these open declarations, the circular recently issued by the Grand Orient of Italy, and calling on all the Italian Lodges to take at once the most energetic action for combating by the ballot-box and by every available means of influence religious institutions in Italy and every man who dares to uphold them,—and you will perceive that there is to be concerted action on both sides of the Alps in carrying out the plan of campaign

against Christianity agreed upon in the supreme council of Masonry.

But, as the article just quoted says, the anti-Christian conspirators have now thrown off the thin veil of half-Jewish ceremonial which governed their former dark and secret proceedings. They can now afford to stand forth in the light of noon-day; to proclaim from the house-tops their principles and their purpose. The beginning of June will behold, and on the Lord's Day, the inaugural proceedings of a Masonic congress which—it needs no prophet to predict it—will have a most sinister influence over the fate of unhappy France during the next ten years, if not for more than the next ten generations.

The "Society of the Rights of Man," which is only a Masonic and revolutionary organism sprung from French Freemasonry, animated by its anti-Christian spirit, ubiquitous like its parent, and ready on every point of France, in city, town and country, to execute the decrees of the Grand Orient, will do its best, as is the wont of the hypocritical sect, to impose on the unwary by putting itself forward as the advocate of popular rights and the generous defender of all that is sacred under the name of liberty.

It was the wise policy of the supreme council of European continental Freemasonry, up to within a few years, to so conceal its hand in the working of political institutions as not to appear in the street or at the hustings on election days. Indeed it was the boast of its foremost representatives that Freemasonry never took an active part in politics. This apparent reserve, however, was first set aside openly in Belgium, where for more than half a century the all-important question of Christian education was the real question for which contended the two great national parties—the conservative Catholics and the Liberals. The latter, from the very foundation of the monarchy, was for the most part composed of freethinkers and Freemasons, who had managed to deceive a certain number of easy-going or ambitious Catholics. Under the late ministry of the notorious Frère-Orban, the Belgian Masons threw off the thin disguise under which they had so long been masquerading, and boldly avowed their purpose of *laicising*, that is, "dechristianizing," all the schools in the country. The Masonic organs declared that the ministers of religion should be excluded from the school, the hospital, the army and the navy.

Education, public instruction at all its stages, the administration of charity or public assistance, the "moralization," as they miscall it, of the sick, the criminal classes, of the camp and the fleet, must be exclusively under the jurisdiction of the state and performed by lay functionaries.

The conspirators against Christendom at once set about pur-

chasing and controlling the public press in all continental countries, especially in such as had been till then, at least nominally, Catholic. And, as France, until the fatal war of 1870-71, had been, in spite of all drawbacks and the advance of infidelity, the leading nation of Christendom, all the efforts of the anti-Christian conspiracy were bent toward "dechristianizing" it.

The Belgian bishops, sustained by the timely and energetic action of the Holy See, overcame the Freemasons in Belgium. There the Catholics had learned from their neighbors in Prussia the value of being thoroughly organized, of knowing each other by name, of counting their own numbers in every electoral district, and of being confident, when election day had come, that every true Catholic would cast his vote for the man who was in favor of Christian education in university, college, academy, and parish school,—in favor of placing army and navy, the needy, the suffering, and the aged, under the blessed influence of religion and her ever-fruitful apostleship.

But anti-Christian Freemasonry, baffled in Belgium, swore that it should win the day in the France of Saint Louis and in the Italy of the Popes. We shall make no further mention, at present, of the triumphs of the anti-Christian power in the latter country, save only to say that the methods and the diabolical strategy which have there proved so successful, are now being tried in France with a confidence derived from the rapid victories of the Revolution in the Italian peninsula, and with all the conscious strength given the sects by nearly twenty years' lease of power and the almost absolute mastery of every department of the administration.

One incident, which has just happened as these lines were written (May 26th, 1888), will suffice to convince the reader that the men who at this moment administer the government in France are in full and open sympathy with the anti-Christian aims of the predominant revolutionary ideas in literature, in science, in sociology, in politics.

No one man in all France, or in all Europe, has been, for the last thirty years and more, so prominently before the public as the apostate, Ernest Renan, whose writings and labors have been directed to the one purpose of proving that Christ was an impostor and of destroying all belief in the divine origin of Christianity. If ANTICHRIST be not a mere abstraction, but a living personification of hostility to Him whom all Christians worship as the Son of God incarnate, then Ernest Renan is the worthy representative and forerunner of Antichrist.

Now here is what has just happened in the capital of France. For some twenty-five years past it has been the custom to hold in

Paris during the month of May a congress of all the learned societies of France (*Congrès des Sociétés Savantes*), under the protection and with the co-operation of the government. These societies number among their most active and distinguished members many accomplished clergymen, many fervent Catholic laymen well known for being the energetic promoters of the noblest popular charities.

Well, on May 26th, the last day of the congress, M. Lockroy, Minister of Public Instruction and Public Worship (!), honored the public session with his presence, delivered an official discourse, and conferred on the most prominent members of the congress various honors in the name of the Government. Foremost among the men thus selected for national reward was Ernest Renan, on whom the minister bestowed the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor, the highest distinction in the gift of the government! But it is the discourse of the Minister of Public Worship, and the eulogy pronounced by him on the anti-Christian apostate, which should be read carefully.

"One duty now remains to be fulfilled," he said in concluding, "pleasing alike to the minister and to the man. In our day there lives a writer who is, at one and the same time, a master of our language, a scholar familiar with the most difficult studies, a man of daring intellect, a sower of ideas, a mighty initiator. He reminds us of many great men, but he only resembles himself; his works are connected with a great movement in French thought, and he is perfectly original. We should not define what he is by recalling Spinoza, or Fontenelle, Plato, Montaigne, or Fènelon, by reminding you that his genius, so peculiarly French, combines the qualities of both Briton and Gascon, or that he possesses the erudition of a Benedictine, the irony of a great comic author, and the fancy of a great poet. I shall not attempt myself to give you a definition of this great genius: I shall merely pronounce the name of ERNEST RENAN.

"Among the pleasant surprises which official power has kept in store for me, the present opportunity is one of those which I never thought I could look forward to. For me, it is a great honor to be able, within the walls of the Sorbonne, to hallow thus, in presence of the élite of our scholars and artists, the leader of that famous mission to Phoenicia on which I had the honor to accompany the future author of the *Origines du Christianisme*.

"It is also pleasant for me to think that, in receiving from my hand the highest distinction which France is this year able to bestow on letters and science, Ernest Renan will himself connect pleasantly with one of the earliest memories of his career the

homage which the government of the Republic pays to his great mind."

None of the French scholars present protested against this sacrilegious act of the man thrust by the irony of fate into the once respected office of Minister of Public Instruction and Public Worship in the ancient kingdom of St. Louis. The aristocracy of birth and talent were there; but not one of these descendants of the Crusaders cared or dared to stand up and stigmatize the act of the minister. From no one of the hundreds of scholars and scientists present came a protest against this consecration of the baneful genius of Renan in the halls where the doctors of Sorbonne were wont to unfold the sublime truths of Christian theology.

Apparently, then, Antichrist has it all his own way in what was, a century ago, "The Most Christian Kingdom," and to the numerous, well-disciplined, and united forces enlisted to do battle "against God and His Christ" there would be in France, were we to draw a hasty inference from such a proceeding as we have just narrated, no army of soldiers of Revealed Truth ready or fit to contend, with any chance of success, against such overwhelming odds.

II.

Thank God, it is quite otherwise, as we shall now endeavor to show.

Not forty-eight hours before the "Congress of Learned Societies" had met in inaugural session, on May 22d, the seventeenth yearly assembly of French Catholics had just concluded its labors. And, on the evening of the very day rendered memorable by the official glorification of Ernest Renan's blasphemies and impiety, the writer of these pages had the honor to be present at another assemblage of French scholars, scientists, statesmen, and magistrates, who meet yearly in Paris to combine the ripest results of scientific observation with enlightened zeal and long experience in dealing with all the social problems of the day. This annual gathering is composed of two distinct associations, founded by that eminent scientist, Frederick Le Play, the author of *La Réforme Sociale en France*; *Les Ouvriers Européens*; *Les Ouvriers des Deux Mondes*; *Les Conditions de la Réforme en France*, and other admirable works, all aiming to concentrate the attention of statesmen and scholars on the real elements of social prosperity, morality, happiness, greatness, and stability, to be found in the institutions, in the public and private life of the peoples who once constituted Christendom. The first of these associations is the "Society of Social Economy," the members of which devote themselves to observing the conditions of the laboring classes among all the nations of both hemispheres, and reporting the results of their conscienc-

tious studies in the form of "monographies," each monography being an exhaustive description of a working-man and his family in each of the trades or labor professions of town and country. Their studies give the clear and full light on the labor question. The other society, or "Social Peace Union," is composed of men devoted to carrying out in practice the reforms pointed to by the studies of the Society of Social Economy. By enlightening both the working classes and their employers on their true interests, on their mutual duties, these generous men restore peace in the manufactory and the mine, between the agricultural proprietors and their farmers, between employer and employees in every field of human labor. The two societies meet together every year to communicate to each other the result of their wide-extending studies and of their labors in improving the condition of the working-man, and in making capital and labor toil together, side by side and hand in hand, in making the earth fruitful and life less of an intolerable burthen.

Let us see what each of these armies is doing for the good of France, and, by their example and teaching, for the good of the entire human family. They are only two of the most prominent of the active forces which an all-wise and all-mighty Providence is using—silently, quietly, and in comparative obscurity—for healing the social wounds of France, and for restoring, sooner or later, the old moral and social order in the convulsed and disorganized Christendom of our day.

Unhappily, the volume containing the report of this year's proceedings in the assembly or congress of French Catholics has not yet been printed. But a glance at the published report of the proceedings of last year will give us some conception of what the children of God are doing here to secure and to enlarge His reign over the homes and lives of men. The congress met on May 10th, 1887, under the honorary presidency of the Archbishop of Paris—the active president being Senator Chesnelong, so celebrated as an orator and as the foremost promoter of every great and good work in Paris and throughout France. The congress divides its labors between four permanent committees, those, namely, on the works regarding Faith and Prayer; the Holy Land and the East; on Education; on the Public Press and Lectures; on Social Economy and distinctively Catholic works. The first of these divisions comprises a sub-committee on Christian Art.

To us American Catholics, with a new world before us, in which to plant and to rear to all the glory of their perfect fruitfulness religious institutions of every kind, every detail of our French brethren's struggles and apostolic labors is pregnant with instruction.

The works embraced by this first committee or section of the Catholic congress, besides all that relate to the maintenance and the spread of faith, include also, under the head of "Prayer," whatever pertains to public worship. Hence the extraordinary zeal with which European Catholics are now promoting popular devotion toward the Holy Eucharist. Catholics in the United States have, indeed, read or heard of the Eucharistic congresses which have, of late years, been celebrated in France, in Belgium, in Germany, and even in Switzerland.

No religious assemblages ever held in Christendom, in ancient or modern times, appeal more powerfully to the Catholic heart, or stir its pulses more deeply, than these Eucharistic congresses, aiming as they do to honor, by private practices of piety and by public and solemn acts of worship, our love and reverence for that gift of gifts, that real Sacramental Presence, which is the glory of the Church, the consolation of our earthly pilgrimage, and the sweet pledge of the Eternal Fruition.

It is time that we in America should take thought and heart to imitate, in this respect and in others, the noble examples of Catholics on this side of the ocean. To be sure—and deep should be our thankfulness for it—the God of our altars and our hearts is not, in the United States, as He is in the countries dominated and devastated by Antichristian Masonry, the object of continual and open blasphemy, while His churches and altars are insulted and profaned. But none the less ought we to profit by the blessed liberty which is our birthright, to graft deeper in the souls of young and old the living faith in our EMMANUEL, and by the most solemn acts of worship to proclaim our belief to the world.

The originator of these congresses was that well-known saintly writer, Monseigneur de Ségur, who, stricken with blindness, seemed to draw supernatural fire and light from his perpetual communion with the God of our Tabernacles. He died just as the first Eucharistic congress was about to be celebrated in Lille, in 1881. But the work which he had thus begun found in the present archbishop of Paris, then coadjutor to the venerable Cardinal Guibert, an earnest promoter, and in Archbishop de la Bouillerie an eloquent and successful advocate. This last-named prelate had everything ready for the celebrating of a second congress at Avignon, the ancient city of the Popes, when he too was called away to his reward by death. The third congress was held at Liège, under the direction of another saintly prelate, Archbishop Duquesnay, who soon afterward passed away from earth. Bishop Mermillod, of Geneva, then made the work of Eucharistic congresses his own special work. Since then Freiburg and Toulouse have each had the honor of holding one of these great assem-

blasges. In Liège, where public worship is free, there was a grand procession of the Blessed Sacrament through the streets of the city. In Freiburg, the head of the Catholic cantons of Switzerland, the display was magnificent beyond description. The whole population of the little state flocked to the celebration. The state authorities, judges and magistrates, the state troops with their commanders, people and clergy, young and old,—all seemed moved by one mighty sentiment of love toward the central sacrament of their faith, and made of Freiburg, on that day, a lively image of the City of God on high.

"O classic land of honor and of liberty!" exclaims M. Champaux, after describing the feast, "since thy hospitable valleys opened wide their bosom to welcome the pilgrims of the Eucharist; since thy hills, like those of Judea, thrilled beneath the footsteps of the God Incarnate; since the chiefs of thy people will be nothing but the lieutenants of Christ,—may all the blessings of Heaven be on thy children, and may they treasure up, to pour them out in the time to come over a world hastening to its ruin, all the promises of regeneration and peace!"

Most extraordinary and unexpected have been the results, in every locality in which they were held, of these Eucharistic congresses. In every district, for instance, yearly assemblies are held, which, besides being solemn professions of faith in the Sacrament of the Altar, and a source of wide-spread edification, have stimulated Catholics to devise new methods of devotion toward their EMMANUEL. After the congress of Lille, societies for the perpetual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, *during the hours of night*, were organized in almost every parish in the north of France! Then a day of more solemn and public devotion was fixed upon for every diocese: the whole of the twenty-four hours preceding that day was to be devoted to the sweet duty of adoration, and the solemnities on the day itself were to conclude with a procession in the Cathedral. Thus, in the city of Lille, eighteen permanent committees or local sections were formed, their members watching in turn, throughout the hours of every Saturday night, before the altars of their respective churches.

This was done to expiate the blasphemies uttered by the press, the sacrileges committed here and there throughout the land, and to draw down on France and her people the graces at present so sadly needed.

After the Congress of Avignon the practice of perpetual adoration by night and day was made a permanent institution in some sanctuaries. At Nîmes the Catholics so arranged the discharge of this new voluntary duty that the various classes of citizens, the trades and professions, each in turn, had their day and their

specified hours for this heavenly work of reparation and intercession.

We can only point out this most blessed result. And how eloquent it is of that deep, living faith, that chivalrous spirit of self-sacrifice, which no revolution, no persecution can extinguish in the heart of Catholic France!

And here comes a pastoral letter of the present Archbishop of Paris, the worthy inheritor of all the heavy cares and apostolic virtues of the venerable Cardinal Guibert. It is devoted to the double object of stimulating the zeal of the Catholic Parisians in favor of completing the votive national Church of the Sacred Heart at Montmartre, and of preparing them for the Eucharistic congress to be opened in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, on Monday, July 2d.

Two extracts from this beautiful pastoral will explain to American readers this double object:

"Ever since the will of God has burthened us with the formidable responsibility of the diocese of Paris," the archbishop begins, "we felt the desire to address you concerning the great undertaking of the Church of the Sacred Heart, and to think over with you what remains to be done in order to complete this sanctuary which lifts its mass up, like the Mercy Seat, on the mountain sacred to our martyrs.

"Scarcely had our venerable predecessor been seated in the episcopal chair of St. Denis, when he appealed to *all good Christians and good Frenchmen* to unite in rearing this votive sanctuary of the nation, 'destined to call down on France the blessings from on high, and to bring back among us peace, security and union, so needful to our country, and which the most skilful devices of human wisdom are so powerless to bestow.'

"The Cardinal wrote these words on June 23d, 1872. Thirteen years afterward, on April 4th, 1885, just after receiving the Holy Viaticum, and while imparting to us his last advice together with such blessing as recalled that bestowed on their sons by the dying patriarchs of old, his very last words were for the great undertaking of the Church of the Sacred Heart. 'We Christians,' he said, with a voice as steady as his heart and his intellect, 'entertain the conviction that this national homage offered to the Divine Heart of Jesus shall be the salvation of France.'

"On March 3, 1876, nine months after the laying of the cornerstone of the Basilica, the Cardinal blessed the provisory chapel which you all know so well. From that day forth, an uninterrupted movement of pilgrimages has impelled the faithful toward Montmartre. The parishioners and parochial societies of Paris; the dioceses of every province in France; foreign nations, even

those of the New World,—all went thither in union with France, to implore the pity of the Heart of Jesus. Such a manifestation moves our soul to its depths; for it proves that our dear France is still ‘the Eldest Daughter of the Church,’ still beloved and encouraged by her sisters among Catholic nations.

“Henceforward the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament exposed on the altar ceases not either by day or by night. Generous Christian laymen, priests and members of the religious orders go up every evening to Montmartre and there keep the holy watches of the night.”

Not alone in the votive Basilica which crowns the heights of the Mount of Martyrs, do the *élite* of Catholic Parisians thus daily and nightly succeed each other before the Mercy Seat; but in more than one sanctuary in the vast, the magnificent, the pleasure-loving city beneath, are there found men and women of every rank whom this thought of perpetual adoration and intercession unites successively through the long hours of sunshine and darkness before the Sacramental Throne of the Redeemer of the world.

If the Judge of all the earth promised Abraham to spare guilty Sodom if but ten just souls could be found in it, surely He will not destroy Paris, when He knows the tens of thousands of the generous and upright of heart, whose daily lives and nightly prayers make such powerful intercession for their brethren; surely He will save France for the sake of the millions who are true to Him—aye, true and tried by as searching a flame as ever sanctified the martyrs and confessors of old.

The archbishop next touches on the subject of the approaching congress: “You have,” he says, “already learned ‘through the public press that the annual reunion of the Eucharistic societies would this year be held in Paris. This will enable you to admire with us the opportunities afforded by Providence.

“The Eucharistic congresses, springing from an inspiration of faith and piety, purpose to unite all Christians in the one thought of adoring and loving the Divine Eucharist.

“The conventions of beneficent associations, and those of scholars and scientists, have a great and glorious function to fill in Christian society. But believers should not forget that in the Eucharist is the source of life for the souls of men and for the social body. . . . Christians there meet together to study the means to extend the reign of Christ living in our midst by His Sacramental Presence. . . .”

We have permitted ourselves to dwell at such length on this subject of Eucharistic congresses because, coming under the section of Faith and Public Worship, it is of the most vital importance; and,

moreover, because we hope to see these matters taken up and made much of by American Catholics.

The reader, after all that we have said about the inroads of unbelief and impiety into all the walks of public and private life, will be prepared to find the enemy met at every step by the manifold Apostleship organized and carried on indefatigably by our brethren in France.

The second committee, the most important of all, is that on "Instruction." France possesses one of the most admirable voluntary organizations known in any civilized country, the General Society of Education and Instruction, whose yearly meeting coincides with that of the general assembly of Catholics, the special session devoted to this all-important matter being the most solemn, the most largely attended, and the most interesting of all.

The society, under the immediate direction of the French hierarchy, is battling on every point of the kingdom for the divine privilege of preserving the souls of the people, parents and children, young and old, the wealthy and cultivated, as well as the poor and unlettered, from the mortal poison of infidel and immoral teaching; for the still diviner privilege of placing within their reach,—of making them taste, love, and enjoy it,—the saving truth of Christianity.

This would be the place to tell American readers the glorious, the incredible story of the generosity of French Catholics in creating establishments of Christian education of every grade in order to meet the need of the young generations of France, while the men in power are "dechristianizing" successively all the schools of France, driving out the religious educators of both sexes from every one of their houses, and spending profusely millions upon millions, yearly and monthly, in the unhallowed work of driving God from the primary school, the academy, the college, the university.

But the Catholic press of America has kept our public so well informed on this point that we need not insist on it here.

One thing only must be said of the sublime spectacle which the Catholic sons of France offer at this moment to the world, in defending the rights of Christian education,—that it recalls the long struggle of Ireland in the same cause. Things have not yet, in France, come to the pass that it is a crime punishable with imprisonment, death, and the forfeiture of one's property, to teach a Catholic school or to send one's children to it. But the day may not be far distant when the qualified liberty given by French law to schools independent of government control and support may

be withdrawn, and no schools be tolerated save such as teach in accordance with the atheistical programme of Paul Bert.

As it is, French Catholics freely, we had almost said joyously, contribute for Christian education sums which we should fear to name, lest we should be accused of gross exaggeration.

A committee of eminent jurists, mostly composed of men who resigned their seats on the bench when the courts of France were called upon to enforce the iniquitous Ferry-Bert law suppressing the religious orders, are attached to this General Society of Education. These gentlemen study the bearing of the anti-Christian school laws, and give to all those engaged in the Catholic schools the benefit of their advice and advocacy.

Every one of these features is well deserving of our imitation in America.

Some passages in the appeal of Senator Chesnelong, the eloquent President of the Assembly, and the head of the General Society of Education, would seem to address themselves to the needs and circumstances of Catholics in our own country,—allowance being made for the freedom that we enjoy in the United States from all State interference with our parochial schools.

"The necessary instrument for the regeneration of our country," he says, "is Christian education.

".... It is not wealth that we lack. Doubtless the prosperity of France at this moment is checked by a complex crisis, the causes of which I need not state here. But labor and economy would soon restore that prosperity, if we only had a government bent on repairing things, which would bring back to the spheres of business the security and confidence needed by our interests.

"There is among us no lack of generosity. This virtue so truly French has not been weakened in our times. Among our fellow-countrymen, nay, among our adversaries, the heart continues to be Christian long after the reason has ceased to be so.

"Nor is it truth that we lack. The Church evermore holds its beacon-light on high before us. Our very ruins would, at need, eloquently preach the truth to those who are capable of understanding their mournful tale.

"What we lack is stability of principle, strength of character and conviction, rule and discipline in our actions, a consistent sequence and cohesion in our wills; the moral greatness of soul, in one word.

"Now, then, in order to give to souls this greatness, this strength, this mastery over self, this devotion to God and to country, this love for truth and justice, this fidelity to duty and to honor, there is only one way of proceeding,—to make the souls of men Christian.

"This, gentlemen, is the work undertaken by Christian teaching. It proceeds from nature's lowliest to nature's most privileged, enlightening their minds, lifting up their hearts, strengthening their wills, subjugating their souls to the glorious servitude of duty, elevating at one and the same time, by a harmonious development, the cultivation of the intellect and that of the moral sense, which are two offshoots of the same stem vivified by the same sap."

"Now, this Christian teaching, banished from the public schools, has to take refuge in our independent schools. Therefore, one of the foremost duties incumbent on Catholics at this day is to support these independent schools. There is no duty which avails so much for the salvation or, I should rather say, for the purchase of souls, as well as for the future greatness of our country."

We need not point out how aptly these eloquent words apply to American Catholics at this moment, in the discharge of their urgent and most sacred duty of procuring for their sons and daughters the priceless boon of Christian instruction and education.

It is the custom of each committee or section, after giving in its report of proceedings since the last General Assembly, to express in the form of a *hope* or *wish* such progressive measures as circumstances render imperative.

The Committee on Education thus formulates its earnest *wish* for the improvement of all departments of Christian instruction in Catholic schools :

"1. As to primary schools. In all that pertains to the creation, the organization, and working of independent schools, [it is most desirable] that, in order to contend successfully with the anti-Christian teaching which, according to the letter of the existing laws, disposes at will of all the administrative, financial, and material forces of the country, the General Society of Education and Instruction should call together all the founders, promoters, and defenders of our schools, and do its best to unite in common action all the supporters of true national instruction, that is, of Christian and independent teaching."

"That diocesan and parochial committees should be everywhere organized for the purpose of establishing and maintaining independent schools, and for watching carefully and combating the anti-Christian teaching of the state schools.

"That the payment of our teachers, fixed and accepted as a duty by all parents able to pay, each according to his means, should be made to secure the funds necessary for the working of our schools, concurrently with the *denier des écoles* (a fund collected on the same system as that of the Propagation of the Faith),

and with the voluntary subscriptions in the country places, and in the city districts and streets.

"As to the Friendly Societies of Alumni, let them multiply their efforts to increase their own membership and the numbers of their adherents; let new associations be formed between old college school-fellows, between the former pupils of Catholic academies and schools; let these friendly associations, by entertaining constant mutual kindly relations, communicate to each other the good they are doing, each in its own sphere, as well as their ideas about a still greater good to be achieved for the defence and support of their religious faith.

"2. As to professional education. Let Catholics exert themselves in developing independent Christian schools for superior primary instruction, for professional and special instruction, as well as to establish higher courses in their primary schools wherever their means and a proper supply of competent teachers will not allow them to create complete educational establishments.

"3. As to higher education. In all that pertains to the teaching of philosophy, let the independent courses of higher Christian instruction be multiplied in all centres where there are a sufficient number of professors and of pupils. Let popular courses be organized in the same spirit, in order to combat and to neutralize the efforts of the materialistic propaganda.

"In what relates to agricultural instruction, and in order to enable proprietors to fulfil the twofold mission incumbent on them of personal labor and patronage toward their employees,—let the knowledge and practice of scientific husbandry be taught and encouraged in Catholic schools of higher studies, as is done in the Catholic Institute of Lille; and let the High School of Agricultural Studies annexed to it be made known and encouraged in every way so as to win the sympathy and support of Catholics."

It is a great happiness to say that what was only a hope and a prayer in 1887 has become a blessed reality in 1888.

It is marvellous to see with what ardor, what ability, and what success the most cultivated and most distinguished Catholics of France,—her true aristocracy of birth and culture,—devote themselves in the great capital and in the other cities of France, as well as in the country places, to the great work mapped out in the above extracts for all who have the will and the ability to save their country by becoming the apostles of revealed truth.

We have barely taken the reader into the outposts of this great army of Christian soldiers, and pointed out here and there a few of the most prominent divisions.

Of the noble host of men,—noble in every sense of the word,—who have long been and are still working to save and to improve

the toiling millions of France, we must not speak here lest we should overstep all bounds of moderation. Suffice it to mention the honored and beloved names of Count Albert de Mun and Léon Harmel,—to tell all who are even slightly acquainted with the labor question in France how much has been accomplished by Catholic laymen in bringing about social peace and restoring the reign of God in the homes of the laboring poor.

Nor is it alone the men of France who have enrolled themselves in this new crusade,—a crusade which requires of every soldier of the cross as stout a heart as ever beat in the bosom of a Godfrey or a Tancred. The Catholic women of France, who are active in the glorious cause of their religion and their country, can also be counted by thousands.

We have before us as we write the *Manuel des Œuvres*, a volume of 553 pages, which contains only a bare list of the manifold works of charity carried on in Paris and in various provincial establishments in connection with those of Paris. By far the greater part of these have been created, and are supported and directed, by the fruitful zeal of Christian women living in the world.

Cardinal Consalvi, the companion, adviser, and supporter of Pius VII., during his exile and imprisonment in France, pays a well-deserved compliment to the great qualities of the Christian women of France. His words are only the echo of the high praise bestowed by another exiled Cardinal, the illustrious Pacca.

The hosts of true men we have glanced at in this paper have been reared in Catholic homes ; they have been trained and armed for the battle by their mothers, their sisters, their wives. They are bound to win in the peaceful strife, in which the eloquent pen and the eloquent speech, and the living example, more eloquent than all, are the only weapons of warfare. These comprise what man can do in the cause of God; He is bound to do the rest. And He will not fail His soldiers.

So, remembering what happened in Catholic France from 1788 to 1800,—the glorious spectacle in Christian history only paralleled in Ireland during the three centuries preceding 1800,—we may feel sure that the torrents of blood shed by the guillotine are the pledge of the victory of the Faith in the land of the lilies.

What a springtide of all the apostolic virtues there was in France from 1804 down to 1870! We know that the enemy was there also, sowing his tares broadcast in the furrows, where religion had been casting the seed of all the good we now behold. That the tares have not choked the goodly harvest in its growth is, taking all things into consideration, a miracle in itself. That the success of the enemy has been only partial, we know. That, in the long run, he is doomed to defeat, we may gather from what has been here said or hinted at.

It is enough to mingle for a day with these faithful sons of the ancient crusaders, in any one of their congresses or general assemblies, to feel, in the absolute trust in God which buoys them up, that they have a certain pledge of triumph.

Let us, therefore, with the same invincible confidence, hope that France's trials, no matter how manifold and how bitter they may be at present, or how portentous of evil for religion are the well-known schemes of the party in power, will pass away, leaving her in the coming ages what she has been in the past, "The most Christian Kingdom,"—"the Eldest and Truest Daughter of the Church."

THE NEW PENAL CODE IN ITALY.

FOR years the house of Savoy has waged a relentless war on the Vicar of Christ, combining hypocrisy with violence, a pretended respect for his divinely constituted authority, while depriving him of all power and even of liberty. Success emboldened it to pursue its nefarious schemes, and the apathy of the great powers of Europe has led its counsellors to believe that no earthly power will raise a finger or utter a word to prevent it from covering the Sovereign Pontiff with insult, humiliation and affront.

The seizure of the Legations in 1859 was the commencement of its career of duplicity and violence. Though Napoleon III. had French troops in Rome, he allowed the Sardinians to occupy that portion of the Papal States known as the Legations, hold a pretended election and annex them to the kingdom of Sardinia. There was no pretext for war against the Pope, there was no war; but a stronger power simply seized territory of a weaker neighbor, and no one protested, not even France, which was lavishing the fruits of the industry and the blood of her sons to build up a state that would stand aloof in her hour of trial and make common cause with her deadliest foe.

This first act of iniquity settled the policy of the house of Savoy. Europe left the Papacy at its mercy. Yet it is a fact worth remembering that Protestant Prussia advocated the maintenance of the patrimony of St. Peter in its integrity.

Step by step every part of the estates of the Church without the

walls of Rome was occupied by the Sardinians, and everywhere a direct hostility to the Church and its head was shown in the seizure of sacred property, the dispersion of religious communities and the disfranchisement of all who remained loyal to the real sovereign.

The title of the so-called kingdom of Italy to the usurped territory rests on no recognized principle of international law; it was not obtained by inheritance, cession, or conquest in lawful war. It was acquired by fraud and violence, and is maintained in defiance of all. France continued to occupy the city of Rome, with an avenue of ingress and egress, maintaining there the sovereignty of the Pope. When the Vatican Council was convened the house of Savoy made a display of its hypocrisy in a form so astonishing as scarcely to be credible. It asked the withdrawal of the French troops in order to ensure freedom in the action of the Council. Every one knew, of course, that the withdrawal of the French troops would have been followed by the immediate occupation of Rome by the troops of Victor Emmanuel, the dispersion of the Council, and the confinement of the Sovereign Pontiff to the Vatican, stripped of all authority in the Eternal City.

Napoleon III. had yielded much to the treacherous power which he had built up, but he would not renounce the traditional policy of France and weaken his own hold on his Catholic subjects by leaving Pius IX. at the mercy of Victor Emmanuel. But the time came when by his fatal plunge into war with Prussia he sealed the doom of his family, threw away the conquests of Louis XIV. and placed Prussia at the head of a new German empire, a perpetual menace to France. He saw France overrun by German armies, which he could not meet with forces equal in numbers, discipline, equipment, or commanders. He withdrew his troops from Rome. Italy never raised a finger to aid France, to which she owed her aggrandizement. She became the ally of the new German empire, and, as the French troops evacuated the city, moved on Rome. The Eternal City was taken by force and the last remnant of the Pontifical territory was annexed to what is called the kingdom of Italy. Pius IX. was a prisoner in the hands of Victor Emmanuel. The latter, indeed, issued a decree in which he stated: "The Sovereign Pontiff preserves his dignity, inviolability, and all the prerogatives of a sovereign." "A special law will sanction the conditions proper to guarantee, even by territorial franchises, the independence of the Sovereign Pontiff and the free exercise of the spiritual authority of the Holy See." The Papacy is of God, its independence is of God, its spiritual authority has the right to its free exercise from God, and it is not for any human authority to prescribe conditions or grant permission which implies the right to prevent its exercise.

We all know what followed. Although Pius IX. protested against the seizure of Rome, Victor Emmanuel left him only the Vatican. All other palaces and institutions were seized. The Bishop of Rome had less power in his own city than any Catholic bishop in England or the United States. The convents, colleges, and institutions which the Popes had created in Rome, all were seized. Even the houses of the generals of religious orders from which communities all over the world were, under the Sovereign Pontiff, directed and guided, were swept away; and this, the world was assured, was done to secure "the free exercise of the spiritual authority of the Holy See."

Yet, to keep up the farce, Victor Emmanuel and his subservient parliament passed, in March, 1871, what they called a law of guarantees. After declaring his person sacred and inviolable, and making any attempt against his person liable to the same punishment as any similar attempt against himself, Victor Emmanuel endeavored to make the Pope one of his menials by assigning him pay as he did his policemen and soldiers.

The powers which the Popes had of all time exercised throughout Italy were not guaranteed, and though one article assured foreign nations that the Pope was to be free to exercise his spiritual authority, nothing emanating from the Holy See has been communicated to the people of Italy except under penalty of any punishment the government of Victor Emmanuel and Humbert might choose to inflict. They create the judges, the law, and the offence.

The ruin of the whole machinery of the government of the Church which ensued, the outrages on the Christian religion, the demolition of monuments hallowed by the most sacred associations, the erection of monuments insulting to the Popes and the Church, and, finally, the attempt to destroy the Catholic missions, throughout the world, by seizing the property of the Propaganda, are too well known to need repeating here in detail.

Emboldened by the impunity which has attended all its acts against the Sovereign Pontiff and the Church, and disregarding the protests of Pope Pius IX. and Pope Leo XIII., who have constantly refused to recognize or ratify the slightest one, this monarch and legislature, illegally seated in Rome, are now preparing another attack on the Church and its Head.

The bishops and clergy throughout Italy have been discharging their sacred duties to the best of their power, amid a host of difficulties, not the least being the encouragement given by government to infidel and socialistic societies, papers and meetings, all laboring to destroy the faith of the people, and alienate them from the practices of religion. The example of those in power no longer encourages the weak and less instructed; on the contrary,

it seems to justify all disregard of religion and morality. Catholic papers are constantly hampered in the diffusion of articles inculcating sound religion and morality, while every scurrility against faith and morals is permitted in the miscalled liberal journals that flood the country. Amid all this, the clergy have labored on with great prudence and zeal. They have done nothing to excite disturbance or discontent. They have preached patience and forbearance. The riots and disturbances all emanated from the socialistic and infidel element to which the government gave full liberty, until at last it finds that, weary of attacking the Pope, the clergy and religion, the socialists and infidels whose growth it has fostered begin to marshal their hosts for the overthrow of the so-called Italian monarchy. Hostile demonstrations against the government are constantly recurring. Indeed, a well-informed journal declares that scarcely a day passes without witnessing some hostile display against the Italian monarchy in one city or another, from Milan to Palermo. The tiara of the Roman Pontiffs is not more hateful to the eyes of this element than the royal arms have become.

The world was deluged for years with statements of the incapacity, extravagance and mediævalism of the Pontifical, Neapolitan and Ducal governments of Italy. If that peninsula could be placed under a united, liberal government, the blessings of the millennium would be anticipated by the happy inhabitants of the land, who, wisely ruled, would advance in education, morality and material development at a rate which had never been witnessed on our globe of great aspirations and petty results. What has been the result? This phantom kingdom of Italy has had opportunity, and abundant opportunity, to show its ability to elevate the masses and increase their happiness. It has had no enemy to contend with; it has been at war with no European power, except during the brief term when it appeared disgracefully as the ally of Prussia against Austria, a struggle in which she can record only defeat on land and sea. Yet it would be difficult to find in the world a government which has done less for the people subject to it than this very government of the kingdom of Italy. It has created nothing but an enormous army that drains the life-blood of the people, an expensive navy, increasing myriads of high and petty officials, and, notwithstanding its confiscation of all the religious property throughout the country, an overwhelming and constantly increasing debt. The people who, under the old governments, lived in peaceful competency by the cultivation of the soil, are now crushed and ground down by taxes of every kind, while the young men are drawn off to become corrupted and unfitted for work in the useless Italian army,—an army, created by the fears

of the unwise rulers, not by any real necessity of the country. Poverty increases steadily ; those of moderate means are reduced to penury ; the prices of living increase steadily. With the enormous sums acquired by the sale of church property and the taxes wrung from the industrious and moral, what great work has this "liberal" government effected ? We look in vain for the promised drainage of the Campagna, or any great engineering work to begin that scheme ; we look in vain for the improvement of the rivers and harbors ; in vain for any great institution of learning ; in vain for any great architectural work in Rome, which will tell future ages that the house of Savoy had control here during the latter half of the nineteenth century. They seem to know and to feel that Rome is not to be long their abiding place ; that they are there only to uproot and destroy, not to leave monuments of their grandeur. So frail, flimsy and discreditable are the tawdry structures reared in Rome by this government or under its impulse, that the very photographers are afraid or ashamed to depict them. All that is monumental dates back beyond the invasion of the northern barbarians. A well-governed country can, except its limits are extremely contracted, or the growth of population above the normal standard, retain its children within its own borders. A large, steady flow of people out of a country shows in most cases misgovernment. There must be tyranny, mismanagement or incompetency in the rulers. Fifty years ago there was no emigration from Italy. Now her people leave her fertile soil and glorious climate by ever-increasing thousands. To remain is to face starvation. With nearly a million of her sons drawn from productive labor to don the uniform of the army, there ought to be abundant employment for those not in the ranks ; but this is not the case. The small farmers and peasants who could once live on their small holdings and lay up money, cannot make both ends meet by the utmost prudence, exertion and economy ; artisans cannot find employment at their trade, and the thousands of unskilled laborers are kept in compulsory inactivity. Emigration is their only hope.

They are arriving on our shores at the rate of more than sixty thousand a year in the port of New York alone, and southern ports swell the number to a degree scarcely to be believed. And what a commentary do these immigrants present on the government under which they have lived for thirty years. You seek in vain for any evidence of public schools, of diffused education, of improved training in agriculture, mechanics, or manufactures. Nothing has been done to educate or elevate the masses, to advance hygienic conditions, to instil manliness, truth, honor, or religion. Even art is dead. There are copyists, but no great painters, or sculptors, or architects. In everything that tends to

increase the well-being of a people, this Italian government is the most amazing and pretentious failure of the nineteenth century. The land swarms with an impoverished and discontented population, who look to emigration, socialism, nihilism, anything in preference to a continuance of their present appalling condition.

Crime increases, and the Italian prime minister, Crispi, has introduced amendments to the present penal code. The hand of the liberal government is to be made heavier and heavier. While he dare not frame a single clause against the most dangerous and destructive communistic bodies, check their utterances in their open meetings, or the wildest outbursts in their papers, he can strike at the Pope and all who look up to him with reverence and respect. To do this he must set at naught all the principles which these "liberal" politicians have been for the last century upholding as inalienable rights of the people; they must deny the right of the people peacefully to petition the legislature for a redress of grievances, to remonstrate against legislation they may regard as unwise or oppressive; they must deny liberty of debate, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press; but Signor Crispi is ready to do all this, and make every one of these acts, which we regard as the heritage of a free citizen in a state, a crime to be punished with all the rigor of the law, even if it be necessary to mete out a punishment greater than that inflicted on the red-handed murderer. And this is the result of the revolutionary attempts to create a free Italy; it is, indeed, an "*Italia irredenta*," bound hand and foot by a band of the most insignificant tyrants that ever ruled any portion of that peninsula.

But if the power of the Italian government is waning, if it dare not strike at anarchy and socialism, it is not so blind as not to see that the attachment to the Pope is strong throughout Italy, and on occasions asserts itself. It feels that if the true Catholics were to turn out in their strength at the polls, the government would find it difficult to carry a single measure through the legislature. The government lives in a manner by the non-action of the Church and those who believe in her divine mission. To terrorize the clergy is therefore the aim of Crispi. In his revision of the penal code, he proposes (Article 101) to punish with imprisonment for life any bishop or priest who, in writing or in any public address, advocates the restoration to the Sovereign Pontiff of any part of his former territory. A murderer in Italy generally escapes with twenty years' imprisonment, but here this minister of King Humbert proposes to punish with a life-long imprisonment any bishop or priest who advocates what Victor Emmanuel promised in his very first decree after occupying Rome. Humbert virtually arraigns his own father, who promised "to guarantee even by ter-

ritorial franchises the independence of the Sovereign Pontiff," and now endeavors to make it a crime in a bishop or priest to advocate the fulfilment of the pledge of Victor Emmanuel. Crispi goes even further. By another section (174) he seeks to punish by six years' imprisonment, forfeiture of all future salary, and a fine of from \$60 to \$1200, any expression, even in private, of a wish to see any such restoration to the Holy Father carried out.

Had any agreement been made between the Pope and the Italian government, severe punishment on all who attempted to overthrow it and create hostility might justly be inflicted; but neither Pius IX. nor Leo XIII. has ever for a moment recognized the usurpation of his city; nor has Italy, nor any government in Europe, least of all no congress of the great powers, ever approved by its consent the action of the late Victor Emmanuel. His occupation of Rome and the Papal States is not sustained by the public law of Europe. In this position of affairs, to make the discussion of the question a crime to be punished by rigorous imprisonment for life, is one of the most monstrous proposals ever made.

The European press has been outspoken in its condemnation of this draconian code; and the amazement at the blindness of Crispi is equal to the indignant censure of his proposed tyranny. Even if he retracts now, or fails to carry his proposed revision on these points through the Italian parliament, it is a fact of history, not to be denied or explained away, that King Humbert's government, in 1888, did actually propose to punish Catholic bishops and priests by fine, forfeiture, and imprisonment, even for life, for discussing a European question.

Of course, the law was not introduced without protest. The episcopate of the two Sicilies addressed to the senators and deputies a letter signed by the archbishops of Naples and Capri, both cardinals, by twenty-three other archbishops, seventy-two bishops, by the abbots of Monte Cassino, Cava, and Monte Vergine, and by several vicars capitular, in all one hundred and two, a protest against the proposed enactments. They declare it exceedingly strange that a state professing to be free should endeavor to suppress a question of public policy by prohibiting any discussion of it, especially when the opinions entertained by the people at large are by no means unanimous. With apostolic firmness these bishops maintain their right to call their clergy to account for any expression of opinion, in word or writing, which may need correction. They maintained, too, their right as spiritual shepherds to guide the flock committed to their care, and freely to communicate to them the words of the Sovereign Pontiff, and themselves address them from time to time such words of counsel and warning as the conscientious discharge of their duties require. They

pledged themselves, in conclusion, never to forget that their mission is to lead to God the souls of all, no matter of what social grade. Similar protests came from bishops in other parts of Italy, and the question has become a burning one.

The remonstrances of the Catholic episcopate certainly required the calm action of the legislature. They would receive it in the Congress of the United States, the Parliament of England, the Reichstag of Germany, or the Cortes of Spain. How has it been received by the pretendedly liberal government of Italy? Signor Crispi, in the *Riforma*, at once came out to defend his proposed action. He treated the protests with the greatest insolence, and, as though the senators and deputies were mere tools in his hands, regarded the question as already settled. He actually made the right of petition a crime. He declared that any protest by the archbishops and bishops of Italy "was a very useless action on their part, and, moreover, an offence which, if the said laws were already promulgated, as they are sure to be before many weeks pass by, would expose them to the unpleasant necessity of regretting their presumption in prison."

He thus actually announced that the law, if passed, will be so construed that a bishop or priest signing a petition to the legislature shall be imprisoned for life. And yet the great cry which deluded many well-meaning men in early days was, "A free Church in a free State." The difficulty will be to find either free Church or free State in Italy.

Crispi has, without any excuse or provocation, brought the Roman question to an issue, and made it a question to be discussed by the whole world. There has been no agitation on the part of the Italian bishops or their clergy, though the question is always there, a menace to the throne of Humbert and the state created by his father. When the Italian Parliament meets the Chambers do not represent a nation. They are merely the caucus of a party, and at any moment the Catholic party may arise, elect its delegates who will enter those halls, and the party caucus will end, the two parties will there be face to face, and every step, every act be questioned, criticized and debated. It is the consciousness of that great absent power which has given the Italian Parliament its peculiar character. You see no parties there, for the great party is absent.

There can be no question that Crispi has been hurried into his present rash and unstatesmanlike course by the worst elements in Italy, the ultra infidel and socialistic class, the real enemies of all civil government in Italy, whom the government must ultimately fight, and can subdue only by the aid of the conservative Catholic population guided by its clergy.

The jubilee of Pope Leo XIII. was a terrible lesson to the gov-

ernment and the communists. They have not learned wisdom from it. That event drew forth greetings, allegiance, respect, marks of devotion from the Catholics of the whole world, and from civil governments, Catholic, Protestant, and even from those beyond the Christian pale. It was an occasion divested of all political bearings. The Queen of England, the President of the United States, could and did join in the general felicitation. Italy could not but feel an impulse that was quickening the pulse of Christendom. From one end of the country to the other came the spontaneous felicitations of millions. The syndic of Rome congratulated the Holy Father; Florence sent a magnificent cross and an address signed by sixty thousand inhabitants of the city and neighborhood. The Italian government stood sullenly aloof, isolated by its own act from the whole civilized world. It vented a petty spite in seizing medals struck to commemorate the occasion, and by removing the syndic of Rome. But it had the clear, distinct evidence that millions in the country were in sympathy with the Sovereign Pontiff, held his person in reverent attachment, and were devoted to the Holy See, the Chair of Peter. These millions were certainly not the ignorant, the immoral, the revolutionary part of the population. They are a conservative, moral, solid element in the land, to which any wise government would look for its support and its permanent existence.

The only hope of the Italian government is in this party, and its support can be gained by placing the Sovereign Pontiff in a position of independence due his character, and virtually promised to the world by Victor Emmanuel. Instead of adopting that course, Crispi, to gratify the turbulent and dangerous element, prepares to persecute the Church, and, unable to strike the Sovereign Pontiff in person, proposes to strike him in his brethren in the episcopate, or the faithful clergy. He may arrest bishops for announcing an encyclical or allocution of the Pope to their clergy and people; he may fill prisons with bishops and priests, but what will he gain? The sufferers under his tyrannical edicts will find sympathizers, even in his parliament, they will arouse supporters and adherents far and near. He cannot stop the voice of the civilized world. In every country and in every legislative hall the importance of the Roman question will be discussed, and the necessity of its solution will be made evident to all mankind. But the laws have not yet passed, in spite of Crispi's boast, and the debates at Monte Citorio (for the legislature sits not in a parliament house that it erected, but in a stolen convent) may lead wiser and cooler men to reject his mad scheme, leaving him to bear in his disappointment the obloquy of his malicious intent.

The Sovereign Pontiff could not, of course, remain silent when

he saw his long-suffering episcopate and clergy in Italy menaced with such a cruel and unrelenting persecution, brought on them by their attachment to his person. In an allocution addressed to the College of Cardinals on the first of June, he referred to the wonderful and spontaneous celebration of his jubilee, and of the marks of respect for the Chair of Peter evinced by delegations and rich presents from all parts of the world. "With the reception of these very honors so magnificently tendered to the Roman Pontiff, there seems to have been a fresh outburst of animosity on the part of those who hate the Church so implacably, and whose evil and hostile disposition during the whole of this time has shown itself more insolently than usual in threats accompanied by insults. And the same persons, finding themselves invested with greater power, now plot with greater confidence, and exciting difficulties everywhere, endeavor to bind the Church with more galling fetters than ever." He then described the laws proposed by Crispi, and continued: "There is no doubt, venerable brethren, as to the object of laws of this kind, especially if they are compared with others of a similar character, and more particularly as the designs of their authors have been sufficiently made known in other ways. They desire, in the first place, by inspiring terror of penalties, to deprive men of liberty in vindicating the rights of the Sovereign Pontificate. It is scarcely necessary to show how unjust it is that some should be permitted to attack at their will the most sacred rights connected and indissolubly bound up with the legitimate freedom of the Church, and that others should not be allowed to defend those rights with impunity. But since it is of great importance to all Catholics that these rights should be made secure, it cannot be doubted that throughout the whole world men will arise who will freely undertake the defence of the Holy See, if the Catholics of Italy, who ought to do so before all others, are prevented by law from taking action in the matter. Now it is well to remember that, as we have often stated, the condition necessary to the preservation of the liberty of the Roman Pontiffs is not prejudicial to Italian interests; on the contrary, it most powerfully and most truly serves them, so that all who uphold that liberty should be regarded, not as enemies of their country, but as most excellent and faithful citizens. These laws of which we have spoken, under pretext of saving the commonwealth, really aim at the enslavement of the Church. But as it is the most sacred mission and duty of the Church to teach constantly and to preserve, even when men offer opposition, whatever Jesus Christ commanded her to teach and maintain, if in the laws and institutions of states there is anything at variance with the Christian precepts of faith and morals, the clergy cannot approve of it, or conceal their sentiments by remaining silent, for the ex-

ample is set before them of the Apostles, who, on being commanded by the magistrates to cease to speak of Jesus Christ and His doctrines, manfully replied: 'If it be just in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, hear ye.' (Acts iv. 18.) What would have been the future of Christianity had the Church become subservient to the institutions of different nations, and obeyed the commands of magistrates without distinction, whether they were just or wicked? The ancient superstition would have remained under the protection of the laws, and there would have been no way in which the human race could have received the light of the gospel."

Crispi and his followers, like the supporters of the Falk laws in Prussia, endeavor to falsify the actual state of the case, and by sophistry throw the blame on the Church by representing the state as merely acting on the defensive and resisting aggression by the Church. This fallacy Pope Leo XIII. exposes: "It is utterly wrong to assert that the state finds it necessary to act against the Church in self-defence. How can this be the case? The Church is the mistress and the guardian of all justice, established to suffer, not to make, attacks. It is too absolutely contrary to truth and justice to subject the whole body of the clergy to such grave suspicion without just cause. Nor is any reason shown why new laws should be passed against them especially. At what time or in what place have the Italian clergy deserved censure for interfering with the public weal or tranquillity?"

Considering the laws and their motive from the standpoint of the Church itself, His Holiness said: "But if we seek higher considerations, it appears how thoroughly the clauses of the law are opposed to the most sacred institutions of the Church. For, by the will of God the Church is a perfect society, and, with its own laws, has its own magistracies, duly distinct from each other in degrees of power, the head of all which is the Roman Pontiff, who has been placed over the Church by Divine authority, and is subject to the power and judgment of God alone. Inasmuch, therefore, as an attack is made on the institutions of the Church, the authors of the law are acting aggressively, not on the defensive. And this do they do by a special law with premeditated severity, and by regulations, not fixed or definite, but vague and most indeterminate, so that he who has to interpret them may do so as suits his own pleasure.

"For these reasons it is our duty to raise our apostolic voice, and to proclaim openly, as we now do, that these laws in question are contrary to the rights and power of the Church, are opposed to the freedom of the sacred ministry, and detract greatly from the dignity of the bishops, of all the clergy, and especially of the Holy

See, so that it is by no means permissible to adopt, approve, and sanction them.

"We complain of these laws, not because we fear the more bitter warfare against the Church which is imminent. The Church has seen other storms, from all of which it has come forth not only victorious, but more resplendent and stronger than ever. Its Divine strength renders it safe from the attacks of men. We know the bishops and the clergy of Italy; and we have no doubt as to how they will act if the alternative is presented of pleasing men or failing in their sacred duties. But what profoundly saddens us is, that the Church and the Papacy are fiercely assailed in Italy, while the vast majority of the Italian people entertain the deepest respect for the Supreme Pontificate and the Church, and show their fidelity to them by an admirable constancy; and while inexhaustible advantages are accruing to the country from the Church and the Pontificate, we are likewise saddened by the thought that, in accordance with the desires of the secret societies, all kinds of resources and efforts are employed to draw from the fold of the Church this people which has been brought up and reared in her maternal bosom. Nor is it a source of less grief to us that steps are designedly taken to envenom and prolong this conflict with the Church which we, for the sake of the Church, and through love of country, most earnestly desire, as we have often said, to see entirely removed in such a manner as justice and the rights of the Church require. To wish that the civil authority should be in perpetual conflict with the Church is a senseless desire, and one most pernicious to the public welfare. Therefore, since we can do no more, we again and again implore God to look down upon us propitiously and grant us better days, and especially to grant that the Italian people may always preserve the faith intact, together with their attachment to the Holy See, and may never hesitate to suffer and endure all things for their sake."

When the Chamber actually proceeded to consider these clauses of the Penal Code and the protests against it, the petitions of the bishops were rejected, but all agreed that Crispi, in his 174th article, had exceeded all bounds, and it was declared to be too arbitrary. It ran in these words : "The minister of a worship who, abusing the moral power derived from his ministry, excites to disregard the institutions or the laws of the state, or the acts of authority, or otherwise to transgress duties to the country, or those inherent in a public office, or prejudices legitimate patrimonial interests, or disturbs the peace of families, is punished with imprisonment from six months to three years, with a fine of 500 to 3000 lire (\$100 to \$600), and perpetual or temporary interdiction from the ecclesiastical benefice."

On the other clauses few dared to show opposition, for fear of being stigmatized as clericals, yet one man, Ubaldino Peruzzi, had the courage to introduce this resolution: "The Chamber invites the government to suppress all those clauses which make ministers of religion guilty in a manner different from other citizens in identical cases."

The final vote was taken on the 9th of June, and the new Penal Code, omitting article 174, was passed by a vote of 245 to 67. It is, therefore, to go into effect July 1st, 1889, with such modifications as a commission appointed to consider 130 proposed amendments, may deem fit.

Before passing laws aimed at the Christian and Catholic religion, the Chamber should have adjourned from the stolen convent to the site of the temple of Liberty or Venus, to commemorate their revived paganism.

The Italian government has thus by a shameful law—a law in utter violation of every principle of a free state—compelled the Sovereign Pontiff to bring the whole question of the position of the Head of the Church before the governments of the world. His nuncios have by this time presented at almost every court in Europe this new evidence of the necessity for international action to place the Head of the Catholic Church in a perfectly free and independent position. The Italian government has nullified every pretext on which it sophistically based its interference with the Papal States, and has shown that it was actuated from the first, not by any desire to relieve the Pope from internal or foreign aggression, but actuated purely and simply by a deep and intense hatred of the Catholic religion, its institutions and teachings.

And how disgracefully it now comes before thinking men in free and enlightened nations! What greater proof of their utter unfitness to rule over a free people can be given than King Humbert and his ministers afford in these proposed penal laws? Here we find them proposing a law punishing in a priest or bishop the exercise of freedom of speech even in a private circle, of the freedom of expressing opinions through the press on a vital public question. It is sought to make it a crime punishable by imprisonment for life for an Italian citizen to speak or write his sentiments, if the oil of ordination or consecration has touched his head, while in the merchant who lives on one side of him, or the artisan on the other, or even in the beggar who receives alms at his door, such expression is not a crime, not a misdemeanor, not an offence, but the legal exercise of an undisputed right. This makes the receiving of orders in the Catholic Church a criminal act depriving the citizen of his rights. And yet the Italian government proposes to go on this issue into the great court of the world's public opinion and solicit a verdict in its favor.

Fear has deprived it of reason. Bluster as it may, it is ever in dread of the Pontifical power which, it knows, must, in time, resume its rights in Italy. A wise and just policy would long since have made the Papacy an element of strength rather than of weakness. Statesmen are fallible, and if Bismarck did not hesitate to go to Canossa and admit that his war on the Church was an error, the House of Savoy need not fear to do the same. Its true line of policy is not to dishonor the statute book by Crispi laws which will be a brand on Italy for centuries, but to retrace false steps, and by restoring the Pope's authority in Rome, make the Catholic Church and those true to it the hearty and zealous supporters of law and order against anarchy and communism.

THE ATTACK ON FREEDOM OF EDUCATION IN MASSACHUSETTS.

The Protest against the Majority Report of the Joint Special Committee of the General Court of 1887 on the Employment and Schooling of Children and against any Legislative Interference with Private Schools : Being a digest of the remarks of the remonstrants at the hearings of the Legislative Committee on Education in March, 1888.

THIS paper is meant, first of all, to be a short account of a serious attack on the liberties of Catholics in Massachusetts, which happily met with a most complete defeat. We do not write it to exult over fallen foes whose humiliation is so thorough as to call for pity, but because such scraps of history may be valuable as well as interesting hereafter. They should be recorded while still fresh, so that the accuracy of the statements cannot be disputed.

Before touching the central point a few remarks on the condition of the Church in Massachusetts are necessary. On the whole, Catholics have little to complain of and much to be thankful for. Churches and schools are multiplying. Catholics, to be sure, have to pay for public schools they do not use, but this has been suffered almost as a matter of course. It is unjust, but all taxes are intrinsically unpleasant, and the injustice passes as yet almost unnoticed. In many public institutions Catholics are still far from enjoying complete freedom of conscience, and proselytism of children by the

agents of the State goes on to an extent that would be alarming did we not remember how much worse it has been. Even where we have not our rights we at least have a hearing, and the American sense of fair play is gradually giving strength to our side. In short, we have made wonderful progress.

That this progress should be unnoticed by the enemies of the Church is not to be expected, and they have chosen the school as the point of attack for two very obvious reasons: first, because they wish to turn the children from the Church, and secondly, because they believe that platitudes about the public school system, "the mainstay of the republic," etc., will make effective war cries.

There have been hints for some time that trouble was brewing; but how many or how powerful were the plotters was not at first clear. It is becoming evident that the movers are a small and utterly contemptible clique, who can boast of no real following.

One of the first attacks was made by the public lectures of the Rev. Justin Fulton, which fitly culminated in a filthy book. The details of neither the lectures nor the book are fit to dwell on, and but for the scandal they occasioned we should be glad of such an enemy. We believe that even the Boston *Transcript* did not glory in him as a leader; but to the shame of the press be it said that, to the best of our knowledge, only one Boston daily paper, the *Advertiser*, condemned his indecencies.

Whether the Republican party wanted a new issue, or whether the leaders were deluded by a few intriguers, we do not surely know, but at their convention in the autumn of 1887 they announced in their platform, without any apparent connection, that they had always maintained the public schools, and pledged themselves to keep them open to all children, "and free from all partisan and sectarian control." The Republican candidate, being duly elected, said what was expected of him in his message. He thought that there was reason for alarm, caused by the withdrawal of many children from the public schools, and suggested remedies, the gist of which were that the public schools should be made so good that the children and parents would cry for them, that private schools should have none of the public money, that existing laws concerning them should be enforced, and new ones concocted if necessary.

The point of this allusion to the laws concerning private schools is now to be explained. The legislature of 1887 appointed a joint special committee "to sit during the recess of the legislature, and to consider the expediency of additional legislation in respect to the employment of children under fourteen years of age, and in respect to the schooling of such employed children."

The ostensible and, we are inclined to think, the real purpose of

appointing this committee was to see whether the existing laws were sufficient to protect the health of children employed in factories, and to secure for them the rudiments of an education.

These surely were objects which commend themselves to all just men of whatever faith, and no one would have guessed that this committee was to be used for the oppression of religion. The committee, having held several public hearings in Boston and elsewhere, finally reported two bills, one relating to the employment of children, which need not concern us, and one amending Chapter 47 of the Public Statutes, which relates to education. The law which for several years has been on the statute books provides that children attending private schools must attend only such as are approved by the school committees, and provides further that these committees shall approve only schools in which the instruction is in English, in which it equals in thoroughness that of the public schools, and in which the pupils make equal progress with those in the public schools. Unjust and arbitrary as this law is, it has thus far been harmless, being so absolutely a dead letter that but few knew of its existence.

The surprise of those interested was great, indeed, when this committee, who had been given no authority whatever to legislate concerning education in general, reported a bill to amend this law, of which the following are the chief features, given in as few words as possible: In the first place, within two weeks of the opening of a private school, having pupils between eight and fourteen, the name and location of the school are to be registered with the school committee, and once a month a list of the names, ages and addresses of the pupils of such ages is to be given to the committee, on such day and in such form as the committee may demand. The committee should not only visit every such school, and approve it or not within six weeks of the beginning of the year, but should visit it once a month, and should have power at any time to rescind the approval. This visitation is to be made by any member of the school committee, the superintendent of schools, and in cities by any authorized agent of the school committee, who shall have power to enter any room, and to examine any private school, as if it were a public school! One would imagine that the framers of this bill must have been taking hashish, and considered themselves three-tailed bashaws at the least, when they proposed these gentle methods of coercing American citizens. But *on ne s'arrête pas en si beau chemin*, and our modest legislators further proposed that after September 1st, 1889, no private school should be approved unless *all* the teachers had certificates from the school committee. To conclude, in order that this should be no dead letter, there is to be a fine of from twenty to one hundred

dollars for every failure on the part of a private school to make the required returns of its pupils, prosecution to be brought by the school committee, and further measures are taken to make the latter body attend to these duties. The provisions of the present law are to remain with these additions.

We may now inquire how it happened that six out of seven members of a committee wandered so far out of their way to make such an attack on their unoffending Catholic fellow-citizens. How it happened that six presumably sane men should have agreed on a bill as silly as unjust, and as irritating as silly, and imagined that it would be accepted by a free and thinking community, passes comprehension. (We can only imagine that they were driven by the madness which precedes disaster. They were politically "fey.") We have occasion to mention the names of but two of this committee. First, that of Mr. Michael J. McEttrick, of Boston, a Catholic, who presented a minority report, in which he showed with much ability that the plan of the majority was contrary to the natural right of the parent, to the liberty of the citizen, to freedom of conscience, and altogether unwise and uncalled for. The other gentleman to be mentioned is Mr. Josiah Quincy, of Quincy, a young man of old and honored family, of social position and education, with both ability and ambition. He it is who is generally credited with the honor of having drawn up the bill. Let us hasten to say that we believe he was less malicious than deluded.

One would naturally suppose that a committee prescribing such drastic legislation had at least been convinced that there was a necessity for it. One would think that the number of employed children whose education is to be protected must be a large one. In point of fact the committee admit that it is small, and likely to be still smaller, for they recommend raising the age at which a child can be employed from ten to twelve years. They themselves say in their report that the census returns of 1885 state that the number of children employed between ten and fourteen was 2994, and that the chief of police stated, in 1887, that the number of children between twelve and fourteen employed in textile factories was 1616. A pretty number, truly! But perhaps these, or many of them, were very ignorant. We have failed to find any definite statement to that effect in the report of the committee. Perhaps, again, they require some high standard before children can be employed. On the contrary, all that they require is that the child should be able to "read at sight, and write legibly simple sentences in the English language." Thus this astute committee recommends a system of tyrannical oppression of all the private schools in the State, so that two or three thousand children be taught to read and write, which these Solons do not deny they can do already.

Finally, perhaps, since they went out of their way to attack Catholic schools with which they were in no way concerned, they had some evidence of deficiencies in these schools. If we are correctly informed, all the evidence before the committee concerning the efficiency of parochial schools was the following: Mr. Levins, of the Salem School Committee, testified as follows: "I don't believe in parochial schools, but I am not fanatic enough to deny that in rudimentary branches the teaching in Salem is equal to that of any public schools that I ever went into. The reading and writing were remarkable. I think I never entered a public school where they were equal in the same direction." School Superintendent Marble, of Worcester, said that the standard of education in the parochial schools of that city is superior to that in the public schools in some directions and inferior in others; but he had no doubt that the general standard met the requirements of the law. Mr. Kirtland, Superintendent of Schools in Holyoke, testified that the parochial schools there compare very favorably with the public schools. It appears, therefore, that the committee had no shadow of excuse for their interference. The question still remains unanswered, how came they to do it? It appears that Mr. E. C. Carrigan, of the State Board of Education, came before the committee and testified, what was true enough, that the present law concerning the approval of private schools by the school committee was a dead letter. He named no names and made no distinct charges, but left an impression on certain members that private schools required attention. Whether a prime mover or a tool, this man has been at the bottom of much agitation against parochial schools, and it appears to be owing to his influence on Mr. Quincy that the report was drawn up as it was. It is certainly sad that a committee appointed for an excellent object should have allowed itself to be transformed into a "no popery" society.

The committee reported two bills to the Legislature of 1888. One, which does not concern us, was referred to the Committee on Labor and passed in due time. The other was referred to the Committee on Education.

The first hearing, on March 6th, was but scantily attended. Mr. Flynn, of the Legislature, proposed that the friends of the bill should take the aggressive, but no one responded, so that perforce the lead fell to the opponents. The chairman of the committee threw himself into the breach by announcing that he was a friend of the bill and was prepared to answer questions. Mr. Marble, superintendent of schools in Worcester, attacked the bill in detail. He thought the registration alone was good, but he pointed out the impropriety of making the school committees relief associations in the cases of the poor. He further condemned the provisions for

inspection and examination of teachers. He felt that the matter might safely be left to the parents, who would see to it that their children received a sufficient education. The side of the bill was then supported by Mrs. Abba Gould Woolson, who really thought that supervision was necessary and that good schools would not object to it. We wonder whether the good lady would adopt the logical sequence that the keepers of orderly houses should not object to the sudden entrance of police inspectors by day or night.

An extremely unpleasant event for the defenders of the bill now occurred in the appearance of President Eliot of Harvard in frank and outspoken condemnation of the part relating to the supervision of private schools. It came with the greater weight that the speaker is an opponent of parochial schools. He argued that it is desirable that the breach in educational matters between Protestants and Catholics should be closed and not widened. He pointed out that the proposed bill "tends very greatly to widen the breach." He further showed how this brings the question of religion directly into politics, as at the annual election of school committees the religion of the candidates will become paramount. "I can hardly imagine," he said, "a less desirable issue to be presented in a town or city election where the population is divided between Catholics and Protestants; and think those of us who are Protestants may look with some apprehension upon what is likely to be the result in those Massachusetts communities where the Catholics are in the majority or are rapidly approaching a majority."

This, indeed, is an *argumentum ad hominem* to the good but ignorant people who fear Catholic progress; but we feel sure that Mr. Eliot would have added, had he been asked, that no man in his senses could fear that the Catholics could do worse to Protestants than the latter propose to do to the former by this bill. Continuing, Mr. Eliot declared that the bill "tends to enlist the sympathy of all persons in our community in behalf of parochial schools who really believe in the rights of individual conscience.

"I have read with astonishment in this bill a short passage against which it seems to me that anybody who is descended from the freedom-loving Englishmen who founded this Commonwealth must protest. It is the passage which provides that the school committee be required to visit and examine once a month, personally or by agent, all private schools, and to pass a vote annually approving or refusing to approve each one, which vote may be rescinded at any time. The bill proceeds: 'For the foregoing purposes any member of the school committee, the superintendent of schools, and in cities, any authorized agent of the school committee, shall have authority to enter any building or room where any such pri-

vate school is in session; any member of the State Board of Education and any agent thereof shall have the same authority, together with the same right to examine such private school as to examine a public school.' Surely this is a very extraordinary proposition to be made in the State of Massachusetts. The State hereby proposes to authorize any one of a large number of individuals, of his own motion, to enter upon private premises without warning, and to examine at his discretion into the confidential and delicate business which is there conducted. This inspection is to be submitted to by everybody conducting a private school for children who may subsequently seek employment. A Catholic member of the committee may invade a Protestant school, or a Protestant a Catholic school; an uncivil man may visit any girls' school, or a meddling woman any boys' school. A fanatical or indiscreet committee-man or agent may at any moment make infinite mischief. *I think it would be hard to contrive a more exasperating and dangerous bit of legislation than that contained in the paragraph I have quoted?"*

Mr. C. F. Donnelly spoke at length as a Catholic in protest against the bill. This speech was able and convincing, but need not be repeated to those who are familiar with the Catholic side.

At the second hearing, the friends of the bill came out in force. The first hearing had been a dismal surprise to them. If they could not bring men of learning and standing to their side, they at least brought what they could, and no man can do more. An auctioneer, said to be a close friend of the Rev. Justin Fulton, declaimed against "Pope or potentate interfering with the public schools of Massachusetts." The Rev. Joseph Cook, after rather innocently admitting that his attention had only just been called to the matter, uttered many words. He became rather amusingly involved in contradictions while protesting his holy horror against any division of the school fund by the fact that the proposed bill would require the employment of agents to look after Catholic schools. Other clergymen followed. The sentiment of the supporters was distinctly anti-Catholic and that was all. One of the opponents of the bill taunted them with having made no attempt to reply to President Eliot without eliciting any response. (The most amusing as well as the most interesting incident of the morning was the appearance of Mr. Josiah Quincy. He stated that he was there to explain the bill, not to advocate it. He seemed far from comfortable, and on being questioned as to his share in the production of the bill of which he is reputed to be the author, he replied that he would not answer the question. The bill was signed by six members, and he accepted one-sixth of the responsibility, no more, no less. He protested that he regretted that the

religious question had come under discussion. Truly if a young and ambitious gentleman of an honored name and good position has been misled into doing the dirty work of the "Know-Nothing" ring, he cannot be expected to wish attention called to it. It was elicited from him that insinuations, but no open charges, had been made against parochial schools by Mr. Carrigan. His defence of the bill was a very weak one, and he frankly admitted that there were objections. He allowed himself some statements concerning the rights of the State as against the parent that he probably will not care to defend. The subsequent hearings need not be discussed in detail. The opponents followed up their advantage by presenting among others Mr. J. W. Dickinson of the State Board of Education, some teachers in the public schools, and especially three prominent men, none of whom had ever been suspected of any leaning to the Church. The first in order was General Francis A. Walker, the distinguished President of the Institute of Technology, who pointed out that such a movement should not be begun without most careful study of the question, and that the issue had not been before the people. His experience as a member of the school committee enabled him to point out the injury to education that must result from forcing upon private schools the defects of the public ones. The Rev. Edward Everett Hale spoke also in opposition, showing that it was humiliating and inconvenient for private schools to teach under the command of the school committee. One of the most telling speeches was that of Colonel Higginson. He argued that there was no body of men to carry out the provisions of the bill, and further that if carried out, all originality would be taken out of teaching. His remarks on the supporters of the bill must have been another trial to these unfortunates. "Mr. Chairman," he said, "I took my first lesson in religious liberty when I stood by my mother's side and watched the burning of the Ursuline Convent in Charlestown, a Catholic convent burned by a Protestant mob; I took my second lesson when in the Know-Nothing days I saw procession after procession of Protestants march through the streets then occupied by Irish Catholics, with torchlights and having every form of insulting banner in their hands, and making every effort to taunt those Catholics out of their houses and bring them into a street fight which, from the self-control of those naturalized foreigners, they failed to do. I hope never to live to see the renewal of those questions, for if those scenes were to be renewed it would not be necessary to go further than this room to find those who would lead the mob." He ended as follows: "It is the right of the parent, within the necessary limits which the State has fixed as a minimum of training, to choose his own school; and any attempt

to invade what is equally the right of Protestant or Catholic by raising a hurrah and bringing together an audience to applaud every sentiment of religious narrowness will never prevail with the Massachusetts legislature or with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts." Words which, in their scathing contempt, must have sounded sadly to the poor ignorant bigots who probably looked on themselves as rather estimable people than otherwise. Two only of the other speakers for the bill call for any notice. One is Rev. Mr. Leyden, once a Catholic, now an "evangelist" and follower of the worthy Mr. Fulton, who retailed stale falsehoods against the Church. The other, the venerable Dr. Cyrus A. Bartol, is worthy of mention as one of the few on the side who can be spoken of with respect. His remarks, however, cannot have brought great comfort to his friends. He professed himself alarmed at the want of religion and manners in the young. "I think," he said, "there is tremendous power in the accusation that our schools are Godless."

At the last meeting, the Catholic position on education was stated by the Rev. Thomas Magennis, of Jamaica Plain, and Mr. Donnelly made the closing speech. This gentleman was practically the Catholic leader during the hearings, and by his skill and energy contributed largely to the result. The auctioneer closed for the bill, declaring that he was opposed to the Catholic Church, "that great political commercial machine," assuming control.

The meetings at last were over, and two points were evident to all. First, that the majority of the committee had willingly or unwillingly been made the tools of the "Know-Nothing" clique for an attack on Catholic education; secondly, that the intelligence of the community, as shown at the hearings, was against the bill. These facts and others, that have been mentioned in the preceding pages, were stated in a pamphlet, the title of which is at the head of this article. This was sent to all the members of the legislature shortly after the close of the hearings. The compilers were so unkind to the friends of the bill as to print in parallel columns the names of the chief speakers for and against it.

The Committee on Education was in no hurry to report. It is understood that at the outset the majority favored the bill. Indeed, several members of the committee that had framed the bill were on the committee to which it was referred, and they can hardly have found the hearings pleasant. They were not the men, however, to reject it entirely, nor were they so infatuated as to imagine it could pass, although they were cheered by a petition from Mr. Fulton's partisans to the number of one hundred and forty, to report it as it stood. At length, after several weeks' delay, they reported a bill, the gist of which was that children of

from fourteen to fifteen who could not read and write should be sent to the public school, and that private schools having children between certain ages should furnish a register, no penalty, however, being imposed for failure to do so. This melancholy apology for the measure, heralded with such a flourish of trumpets, went first to the Senate, where it was speedily killed. In view of this result, it is amusing to note the mock modesty of the peroration which concludes the report of the majority of the committee that presented the original bill. "In conclusion, the committee ventures to express the hope that the result of its labors may receive such favorable consideration at the hands of the General Court that its appointment may in some measure be justified, and that the Commonwealth may receive some sufficient return for the expense incurred." Sweet hope, but vain!

There is little doubt that the present anti-Catholic movement is partly for political effect. It is not likely, however, to be a useful party weapon, for Democrats can rival Republicans in pledging themselves to defend the public schools with as much relevancy as Mrs. Micawber reiterated that she never would desert Mr. Micawber. It is well for us that it is so, for the Catholic cause could only suffer in the long run from any political alliance. The movement is the work of a few men, and is the more contemptible that it is conducted apparently with the express purpose of deceiving the ignorant and of embittering bigots. The past winter has taught two important lessons. We Catholics must not allow our contempt for such agitation to induce us to stand aside and offer no opposition. If we had not fought the now defunct bill from the beginning, but had assumed that its own weakness would be fatal to it before the legislature, instead of winning a decisive victory, instead of showing publicly how puny were its friends and how strong its opponents, we should have fought an unplanned battle, and very possibly have met with defeat.

The second and most encouraging lesson is, that the facts once fairly presented, justice is far stronger than anti-Catholic bigotry in Massachusetts.

THE CONCORD SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY.

TO say that the Concord School of Philosophy is a New England echo of Hegel is a criticism that does not in the least invalidate its teachings in the opinion of its disciples. Hegel to them is a master of infinite meaning, to be indefinitely interpreted and reverently followed. To allege that its tenets are pantheistic is to attack it at a point where victory would be fruitless. Its exponents admit the force of the argument, and dispassionately ask : "What of it? If pantheism be the logical outcome, let us accept it." To push them to the practical conclusions of pantheism in the ethical world but serves to drive them to the intangible stronghold of the phenomenal world. Things of time are only illusions, cloud-shapes, without permanence, and the right and wrong of the human act, although of temporal moment, are in the end indifferently merged in the Eternal.

The adherents of Concord do not stand on the same ground with ourselves. They have assumed a position which we in vain assail with the ordinary weapons of logic. This for two reasons; first, because they have accepted as a premise a principle altogether at variance with reason, and secondly, because they have failed to precise the true nature of the rational faculty itself. The principle of contradiction, as an instance, has no force as against them, because what the finite reason perceives to be contradictory is seen by Concord to be absolute unity in its ultimate resolution in the Infinite. It is simply the imperfection of two finites that holds them in opposition. Lift their limitations, and we have a perfect reconciliation. Again, the human reason is a finite manifestation of the infinite reason, or more accurately, is the infinite reason welling up into consciousness in this world of time and space.

So much *currente calamo*. To come down to a particular consideration of the Concord School, we may take, as a fair and as nearly complete an exposition of its doctrine as we have been able to find, a pamphlet entitled, "Philosophy in Outline," by Professor William T. Harris, the now acknowledged leader of the school. As the title-page explains, this brochure is "a brief exposition of the method of philosophy and its results in obtaining a view of Nature, Man, and God." This is the only effort we have yet seen to put the teachings of Concord into systematic shape, and from it we may, perhaps, gather what is the actual thought of the school touching these grave problems.

Professor Harris, or let us say the Concord School, to avoid all personalities, begins with the consideration of the nature of time

and space. Time and space, we are told, are presuppositions of experience. Space is first treated.

"In all experience we deal with sensible objects and their changes. The universal condition of the existence of sensible objects is space. Each object is limited or finite, but the universal condition of the existence of objects is self-limited or infinite. An object of the senses possesses extension and limits, and consequently has an environment. We find ourselves necessitated to think an environment in order to think the object as a limited object."

"Here we have, first, the object, and secondly, the environment, as mutually limiting and excluding, and as correlatives. But the ground or condition of both is space ; space makes both possible." (Page 4, § 4.)

Space, we are told in the above quotation, is a presupposition to experience, and the method of arriving at this conclusion is placed before us. To think any sensible object is to think it as limited ; to think it as limited is to think it over against another sensible object which limits it. Therefore, to think any sensible object is to think it with an environment or in space. Admitting the force of this, where is there room for the conclusion that space *presupposes* the object ? What is here meant by *presupposes* ? Is it that there is an actual space pre-existing as a receptacle in which the object will find a place, or does it mean that the intellect already possesses the idea of space before it thinks any particular object as occupying it ? From the context we infer the latter is the meaning, for in the next paragraph we are informed that "space is a necessary idea." Accepting this meaning, what validity has it ?

We are at once thrown upon Kant's *a priori* ideas of space and time, which Concord has naturally enough received as an inheritance from its German ancestry. To confute Kant is not now our purpose. To condemn Concord because it has adopted Kant's notions of time and space would be as futile as putting a fish in the sea to drown it. It is sufficient to say a few critical words upon the position assumed, no matter whence drawn, for we shall carefully refrain from coupling the Concord School with the name of any philosopher or philosophy.

Concord tells us that each sensible object is limited or finite. This we admit. We are also told that each sensible object has an environment, or something other than itself around it, which, in its turn, is limited by every other surrounding sensible object. This also may be conceded. "Here we have," says Concord, "first, the object, and secondly, the environment, as mutually limiting and excluding, and as correlatives. But the ground or condition of both the object and its environment is space. Space makes both possible." Space, then, is neither object nor environ-

ment; it is a *tertium quid*. But what is this *tertium quid*? The answer is given in the next paragraph:

"Space is a necessary idea. We may think this particular object or not—it may exist or it may not. So, too, this particular environment may exist or not, although *some* environment is necessary. But space must exist, whether this particular object or environment exists or not. Here we have three steps towards absolute necessity: (1) The object, which is not necessary, but may or may not exist—may exist now, but ceases after an interval; (2) the environment, which must exist in some form if the object exists—a hypothetical necessity; (3) the logical condition of the object, and its environment, which must, as space, exist whether the object exists or not."

From this we glean the following: Whether we think this or that object, which is particular and contingent, if we think any object at all, we must *a fortiori* think some environment; we have, therefore, a contingent and hypothetically necessary environment. But Concord, with a metaphysical agility which cannot be explained except as the inexplicable, bounds at once into an absolute necessity, and calls it a logical condition, "which must, as space, exist whether the object exists or not." A little closer view may give us a little clearer insight into this wonderful process. Given an object and environment, every other object is the environment of each particular object. Every object, therefore, is environment in spatial relation to all other objects. For instance, the chair in which one is sitting, is an environment to the body, and the body in turn is environment to the chair. What, then, is space? We are assured by Concord that it is neither object nor environment. As every particular object in the universe may or may not exist, environment, which is made up of innumerable particular objects, may or may not exist. Therefore, environment is contingent—not necessary. But we have been told that some environment is necessary. Space is either made up of the sum total of object and environment, or it is a third something which is neither. If it be the first, it cannot be infinite, for each object and each environment is particular and contingent, and hence not necessary. Therefore, the sum-total which they constitute is not necessary. If it be a *tertium quid*, what may this be? Let us once more listen to Concord's own words:

"Again, note the fact that the object ceases where the environment begins. But space does not cease with the object nor with the environment; it is continued or affirmed by each. The space in which the object exists is continued by the space in which its environment exists. Space is infinite."

Space is infinite, because every block of space is limited by another block, which makes it self-limited, that is to say, not limited

at all, therefore infinite. Each particular space is the continuation of another particular space; therefore, being continuous, it is infinite. The ground here taken for the infinitude of space is the continuation of the environment; but environment is the coextended series of innumerable particular objects, and hence cannot ascend into the sphere of the infinite. How, then, can the finite be the basis of the infinite? A concrete example will make this clearer. One table is ranged alongside another, a third alongside the second, a fourth alongside the third, etc. In the series we have table limited by table, or self-limited, and therefore infinite! Paragraph 9, page 5, Concord says:

"If any limited space has space for its environment, it is not limited by it, but continued by it. Any possible limited or finite space is continued by an environment of space, and the whole of space is infinite."

Let us here substitute the word *table* for the word *space*:

"If any limited *table* has *table* for its environment, it is not limited by it, but continued by it. Any possible limited or finite *table* is continued by an environment of *table*, and the whole of *table* is infinite."

This is what the Concord School calls an "insight into the constitution of space," at the same time assuring us that it is not a "mental image or picture of space." By mental image or picture, Concord means what the Scholastics call the phantasm of the imagination. "Conception (of space) in that sense," says Concord, "would contradict the infinitude of space, for an image or picture (phantasm) necessarily has limits or environment." With all due deference to the reputation of Concord, it must be said that it is this very image or picture which Concord has been all along talking about. This self-limiting space is nothing more than one phantasm projecting beyond and continuing another. Each time Concord has pictured any one portion of space an accompanying and contiguous phantasm has risen up in its imagination. Every phantasm so awakened has limits, and alongside of it have arisen the contiguous limits of other phantasms; these limits have been fancifully eliminated by blending this series of images into one. In this way, Concord has conjured up what it terms self-limiting or infinite space. One might as truly say that an indefinite number of frameless portraits in an endless picture-gallery are infinite because they are hung alongside each other. It is out of this continuous series of indefinitely projected phantasms that Concord has woven its self-limiting space. A fancy precisely similar, indeed identical, is that imaginary process of picturing the limits of the universe. When we arrive at the extreme end of the world, what is beyond? Why—let us see—air, or ether, or something of a like subtle nature. But ether, or air, or that other something, is

in space, and so continues the universe—we haven't come to the end of the world after all. Try as hard as we may, after this fashion, we never will; for, we are simply *imagining* a limit to the universe, and in so doing inevitably project an *imaginary* picture of something beyond. As often as we attempt to picture limits, just so often will we continue them by pushing another picture into a *possible* space beyond. Concord has permitted itself to be deceived in this way into confounding a phantasm with a pure concept. Space consists of the dimensions of the body containing relative to the body contained. The intellectual concept of space is an abstract and universal idea, applicable to any and all parts of space, complete in itself, and equally predicable of this book, or this room, or of the sum total of bodies in the universe. It has no more infinitude about it than any other universal. Concord has mistaken a phantasm for a pure abstraction. We may conjure up phantasms innumerable, until the imagination grows weary with the effort, and never come to the end of them; but this process will no more make an infinite than the reduplication of images in a mirror would.

Time shares the same fate as space in the hands of Concord. One part of time limits another part; therefore, time is self-limited or infinite. Here, as before, we have one phantasm chasing another in endless pursuit, from which Concord conceives its abortion of the infinite. To-day is limited by yesterday, and will be limited by to-morrow; therefore, all to-days, yesterdays, and to-morrows make an infinite time. By way of parenthesis, we might ask if the first day that ever dawned throughout this universe of mutable creatures had a predecessor? Concord would, of course, answer that there was no first day, which is simply begging the question. It is one thing to assume that there was no first day, and quite another to show that a first day was an impossibility.

Summing up its chapter on Space and Time, Concord says:

"Experience is thus a complex affair, made up of two elements—one element being furnished by the senses, and the other by the mind itself. Time and space, as conditions of all existence in the world, and of all experience, cannot be learned from experience. We cannot obtain a knowledge of what is universal and necessary from experience, because experience can inform us only that something is, but not that it must be. We actually know time and space as infinites, and this knowledge is positive or affirmative, and not negative. Just as surely as an object is made finite by its limit, just so surely is there a ground or condition underlying the object and its limit, and making both possible; this ground is infinite." (Page 6, § 14.)

It will not do to ask for the logical warrant of the conclusion that experience furnishes us with no element that goes to make up

our notions of space and time, for that would be violating the canons of Concord. But, at least, we have the temerity to dispute the grounds of the assumption. Concord presupposes time and space. They are *a priori* logical conditions, necessary, universal, and infinite, which the mind possesses prior to all experience. These notions are a sort of infinite moulds, into which all the dimensions and successions of the objective world are poured. As they are pure forms of the intellect, there is no reality corresponding to them in the outside world. Why, then, there should be any reason for them in the human intellect at all, we are left to conjecture. Concord may refer us to Kant. But Kant laid them down arbitrarily. We cannot know objects without recognizing them under these forms, is his argument. But these forms have no corresponding reality in the object itself. The objective furnishes us with nothing of them. What, then, have time and space to do with the objective world? Nothing. The forms of time and space, therefore, afford us no knowledge of the objective world. They are only as frames to a picture, if they are even that much. Knowledge is intellectual seeing; an object, to be seen, must be visible; to be visible, it must have a capacity of its own to be seen. It can be known only in so far as it has that capacity, and it can only make visible what it possesses. But if it has in itself nothing of space and time, it cannot make itself visible in space and time, and to cognize it under these purely subjective forms is not to reach any knowledge of the object at all. It is simply to have intuition of the presuppositions of space and time already in the mind, and leave the object where it was—in darkness. This may seem grandiloquent under the title of transcendentalism, but even the flickering flame of a rush is more serviceable than the utter night of a thousand burned-out suns. Certainly, we may be pardoned if we turn to the common-place dictates of reason, after the stupendous nothingness of the transcendental. It may sound very like discord in the cultured ear of Concord, to hear that space and time have a very finite reality in the objective world; that they are (we trust it will not be too distressing to hear) accidents of the finite creatures of this universe; that our ideas of space and time have a foundation in things themselves; that just as much of an objective reality corresponds to these universals as to any other; and, to lay on the last straw, that experience does furnish us with our notions of time and space, not formally, it is true, but with the material from which the intellect abstracts its concepts. It is very obvious to common sense that, when we see an object in space and time, our reason for so seeing is that the object is as we see it; it is evident that there could be no possible reason for seeing an object in space and time, unless it were there. It is also obvious that if the intellectual vision alone furnished space and time to the objective world,

we would only be denying the objective by transferring it to the subjective world; in other words, we would have no objective world at all. At the same time we would be the victims of a very radical illusion. We would first imagine that we perceived an objective reality; this we would speculatively correct, when we should have gained that transcendental insight into space and time, which Concord reveals to the initiated. But, then, in practical life we would be forced to readjust our speculative conviction, and act after all as if the objective world were a reality. We would have to tolerate the illusion, and regulate our lives upon a conscious deception, as if it were truth impregnable. But to Concord nothing is impossible.

The most interesting feature of Concord philosophy is its doctrine of what it has labeled *Causa sui*. It is not only abstruse and seriously complicated, but partakes of the charm of novelty. Space and time have already been catalogued as infinites; but, strange to say, they are not absolute infinites; they have, as their presupposition, *Causa sui*.

The great end and aim of Concord is to establish the absolute unity of the universe. This it effects by identifying all things in its *Causa sui*. After having precised space as the mutual exclusion of parts, and time as the mutual exclusion of successive moments, both of which are infinites composed of innumerable finites, Concord proceeds to gauge causality:

"We may look upon an object as the recipient of influences from its environment, or as itself imparting influences to its environment. This is Causality."—(P. 9, § 22 (3).)

And, again (p. 10, § 26):

"If we examine causality, we shall see that it again presupposes a ground deeper than itself—deeper than itself as realized in a cause, and an effect separated into independent objects. This is the most essential insight to obtain in all philosophy."

"(1) In order that a cause shall send a stream of influence over to an effect, it must first separate that portion of influence from itself.

"(2) Self-separation is, then, the fundamental presupposition of the action of causality. Unless the cause is a self-separating energy, it cannot be conceived as acting on another. The action of causality is based on self-activity.

"(3) Self-activity is called *Causa sui*, to express the fact of its relation to causality. It is the infinite form of causality in which the cause is its own environment, just as space is the infinite condition underlying extended things, and time, the infinite condition underlying events. Self-activity, as *Causa sui*, has the form of self-relation, and it is self-relation that characterizes the affirmative form

of the infinite. Self-relation is independence, while relation-to-others is dependence."

Here self-separation is declared to be the true principle of causality. Self-separation is translated into self-activity, and self-activity into *Causa sui*, "the spontaneous origination of activity." In all this there is something mystical. This is a typical species of transcendental logic in these tremendous leaps from self-separation to *Causa sui*. That "a cause may send a stream of influence over to an effect, it must first separate that portion of influence from itself." We will take it for granted that Concord is speaking of an efficient cause, although no mention is made of the various kinds of causes. A cause, then, has, or is, an influence in separable portions. The exercise of causality lies in this active separation of self-influence, and transmitting it to another. This constitutes self-separation. Is this self-separation the separation of the substance of the cause itself, or not? From the use of the term self-separation, we find room to draw the inference that it does mean an emanation of substance from the cause to the effect. As we will see further on, we shall find ample warrant for this construction of the term in the light of Concord's idea of God. It is clear that the notion of cause as a self-separating substance is an easily paved way to the rankest pantheism, especially when the ultimate analysis of cause is to end in a *Causa sui*, which, in the words of Concord, is "the principle of life, of thought, of mind—the idea of a creative activity, and hence also the basis of theology as well as philosophy."—(P. 11, § 27.)

That we may gather a yet clearer notion of causality within the meaning of Concord, let us examine into its application to the Concordian notion of Deity:

"Self-cause, or eternal energy, is the ultimate presupposition of all things and events. Here is the necessary ground of the idea of God. It is the presupposition of all experience and of all possible existence. By the study of the presupposition of experience, one becomes certain of the existence of one eternal energy which creates and governs the world."—(P. 13, § 33.)

But what is *Causa sui*? We will let Concord explain in its own words:

"(1) It is clear that all beings are dependent or independent, or else have, in some way, phases, to which both predicates may apply.

"(2) The dependent being is clearly not a whole or totality; it implies something else, some other being on which it depends. It cannot depend on a dependent being, although it may stand in relation to another dependent being as another link of its dependence. All dependence implies the independent being as the source

of support. Take away the independent being, and you remove the logical condition of the dependent being. If one suggests a mutual relation of dependent beings, then, still the whole is independent, and this independent furnishes the ground of the dependent parts.

"(3) The dependent being, or links of being, no matter how numerous they are, make up one being with the being on which they depend, and belong to it.

"(4) All being is, therefore, either independent or forms a part of an independent being, from which it receives its nature.

"(5) The nature or determinations of any being, its marks, properties, qualities, or attributes, arise through its own activity, or through the activity of another being.

"(6) If its nature is derived from another, it is a dependent being. The independent being is, therefore, determined only through its own activity; it is self-determined.

"(7) The nature of self-existent beings, whether one or many, is, therefore, self-determination. This result, we see, is identical with that which we found in our investigation of the underlying pre-supposition of influence or causal relation. There must be self-separation, or else no influence can pass over to another object. The cause must first act in itself before its energy causes an effect in something else. It must, therefore, be essentially cause and effect in itself, or *Causa sui*, meaning self-cause or self-effect.

"(8) Our conviction, at this stage of the investigation, is, therefore, that each and every existence is a self-determined being, or else some phase or phenomenon dependent on self-determined being. Here we have our principle with which to examine the world and judge concerning its beings," etc.—(Pp. 13-14, § 34.)

In brief, Concord's argument is this: Given dependent beings, we must ultimately arrive at an independent being upon which they depend. But with the most patent disregard for the logic of the situation, Concord declares that, although this or that dependent being cannot be independent, "still the whole is independent, and this independence furnishes the ground of the dependent parts." This or that dependent being cannot be independent; but this *plus* that, *plus* all other dependents in mutual relation are independent. A is essentially a dependent being; so is B; so is C; A depends upon B, and B upon C, and *vice versa*. This is, of course, a relation of dependence; but Concord, by some feat of metaphysical legerdemain, develops an independent out of these essentially dependent relations! "All being is, therefore," concludes Concord, "either independent or forms a part of an independent being." To be a part of an independent is, of course, virtually to be independent. Now, this independent, which is the cause of all

dependent beings, must be self-determined or self-caused. It is not only cause of all others, but cause of itself, *Causa sui*. "It must essentially be cause and effect in itself, or *Causa sui*, meaning self-cause or self-effect." Cause, Concord has told us, must be a self-active being, *i.e.*, before it can act upon others it must act upon itself; it must be both subject and object; it must be both cause and effect. Before it can impart its influence to another, it must first energize upon itself. There must take place a self-separation within itself, and this is to make it cause and effect in one. This is Concord's final word, and in this conclusion we find the reason of the ready complaisance with which this "philosophy" looks upon all contradictions as reconcilable in their ultimate analysis. In the finite, cause and effect are in antithesis, separate and distinct. In the infinite, they are absolutely one, or *Causa sui*. The method of arriving at this unique conclusion is peculiar to Concord, but it hardly fits into the philosophic and common-sense notions of human intelligences. A cause is, in the meaning of metaphysics, that which in any way produces another; an effect is that which is produced. The cause gives being to the effect. Plainly, then, the effect cannot exist prior in order of being to its production by its cause. Before the causal act it was nonentity. The cause must, in the order of being, antecede its effect. But in Concord's *Causa sui* we have an effect which is its own cause. It existed before it was. It antedated its own existence. As cause it cannot be until it becomes effect, for it is both in one.

Pursuing this astonishing method, Concord has stumbled into the blunder of attributing a mixed activity to the First Cause. Effect necessarily implies passivity, and in no effect can there be pure act. Effect postulates the reception of something which the effect had not; therefore, potentiality. The First Cause must be pure act, or it could not be first. To be other than First Cause would bring it into the category of created beings, implying passivity and potentiality. This is what Concord has done. It traces all dependent being to a necessary first being; but then turns upon its own position and invests this first with the attributes of a second or dependent being. There can be no effect within the being of the first cause, and it is cause only in relation to that order of beings which it creates, and can never stand in relation to itself as its own cause. In the very fact that it is first independent being, there cannot be the shadow of effect in its own act. Its essence is pure act, and to predicate passivity of it would be to deny that it is first. Concord has made the unpardonable mistake of making it essentially a cause-effect. In investigating the nature of finite being, Concord found that all secondary causes were in reality effects in their relation to the First Cause. It

jumped, therefore, at the monstrous conclusion that the First Cause must also be an effect ; but plainly not the effect of another—then the effect of itself—*Causa sui*. Such a conception is radically vicious ; it is simply a contradiction, from which there is no escape in the sophism that the First Cause is perpetually annulling all passivity within itself by a process of spiritual evolution. The First Cause can neither be the effect of another nor of itself. There is no self-separation possible to it, whereby it becomes the passive object of its own thought, for its thought is its very essence in purest act. It is pure thought, pure act ; its essence is its thought ; its act its essence, and its thought its act in absolute unity. Nor can it even think itself as its own object (except in a logical sense), for its thought can be none other than its own self-luminous essence. It is the most simple pure act, eternally perfect. In its own most perfect being it can be cause only relative to its creature, much less can it be its own effect. It is absolute. It is only cause in the relation of *created being to its creator*. Concord has simply applied a pantheistic notion of causality to the idea of a first being. Its *Causa sui* is in reality only the *natura naturans* of Spinoza. It is an eternal being perpetually propagating itself. Concord tries to make it personal, and even goes to the amazing length of building out of this abortive conception a triune God, and drags revelation violently into the domain of philosophy pure and simple. Concord's trinity rests upon its *Causa sui*, which we have seen to be a fiction of its own making. We will leave it to its logical fate.

Aristotle, we understand, was the subject-matter of Concord's last summer's deliberation. It is to be hoped that a clearer comprehension of Aristotle than Concord has yet shown itself to have compassed, will be effective in straightening out its notions of time, space and a First Cause. So far, it is evident that Concord has not accepted Aristotle's idea of a first being; for in the very pamphlet under consideration, in the chapter which introduces us to Concord's *Causa sui*, we find this : "Aristotle, who is careful not to call this energy (First Cause) self-movement, but considers it to be that which moves others, but is unmoved itself, defines it likewise to be the principle of life." What a pity that Concord has not been as careful in its definition of a first cause as Aristotle was. It is because our New England school has not exercised the same discreet accuracy that it impales itself upon the folly of *Causa sui*. Self-movement, Aristotle saw, was incompatible with the nature of a first being, for it implies passivity, and so conflicted with the pure activity of the absolute. The First Cause, therefore, Aristotle concluded, is unmoved, uncaused.

May Concord profit by the teaching of the philosopher.

Book Notices.

CHRISTIANITY IN THE UNITED STATES. From the First Settlement Down to the Present Time. By *Daniel Dorchester, D.D.* New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Howe. 1888.

This is a volume which, in the quality of its performance, falls lamentably short both of its large size and its still larger pretensions. It is a collection of biographical, historical, and statistical statements, which it has evidently cost the author of the work much labor to gather and compile, and which would make it valuable for reference could those statements be relied on as impartial and true.

In his preface the author says: "Conscious that the historian cannot too carefully guard lest he discolor or distort by his lens, the work has been undertaken with conscientious convictions, in the hope that the best interests of Christianity may be subserved by it." As respects the Catholic Church, he says: "The Roman Catholic Church has been freely, fully, and generously treated."

It is to be regretted that the work on examination entirely fails to verify these statements. It frequently reveals a spirit of intense partisanship, and a lamentable disregard for truth. This, however, is not surprising when we learn from the author's preface that he derived from the late Dr. Robert Baird, whom he styles "that eminent historian of *Religion in America*," the inspiring spirit of his book, "by correspondence held with him upon questions pertaining to the religious history and prospects of our country."

These remarks are all the more necessary because the writers of notices of the work in a number of newspapers and periodicals, trusting to the author's sincerity, have repeated the statements of his preface, and thus have been misled into expressing a more favorable opinion of the work than a careful examination would have permitted them to give.

He frames elaborate apologies for the exclusion of Episcopalians by the early Puritan colonists of New England; for their persecution of Baptists, Quakers, and Catholics, and for the slaughter and almost total extermination of the Indians. But it is in his treatment of the Catholic Church and its movements in the United States that his unfairness and intense prejudice become more conspicuous. He speaks of the earliest Catholic missionaries as "gifted and devoted emissaries." The movements of the Church to propagate the faith are styled "plots" and "machinations." He attempts to belittle the labors among the Indians of the early French missionaries, who he imagines were all "Jesuits," by telling his readers that they took no pains "to make the Indians cleanly," and "were regardless of filth, vermin, and immodesty." "The religion they taught consisted of a few simple ritual ceremonies, the repetition of a prayer or chant, and the baptismal rite. Thus the doomed heathen was easily turned into a professed Christian and an enfranchised citizen of France. Didactic, moral, and intellectual training was deemed unessential." The accounts of the "Lay Trustee Contest," the "Common School Contest," the "Native American and Know-nothing Movements," are specimens of unfairness and untruthfulness. The falsifications of Dexter A. Hawkins, in the *New York Tribune*, pretending that

vast amounts of "public money and public property" were surreptitiously "bestowed upon the Catholic Church" in New York city, are repeated, without a word of allusion to the fact that those misrepresentations have been thoroughly and conclusively exposed and refuted.

But the audaciously false declaration which he puts into the mouth of Most Rev. Archbishop Ryan, of Philadelphia, caps the climax of this unscrupulous writer's untruthfulness. Referring to the action of the Vatican Council, promulgating the infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff of the Church as a dogma of the Catholic faith, he says: "The following recent utterance of Bishop Ryan, of Philadelphia, is a direct logical sequence of the doctrine of papal infallibility." The pretended "recent utterance," which is put conspicuously as a foot-note, is as follows:

"We maintain that the Church of Rome is intolerant—that is, that she uses every means in her power to root out heresy. But her intolerance is the result of her infallibility. She alone has the right to be intolerant, for she alone has the truth. The Church tolerates heretics where she is obliged to do so; but she hates them with a deadly hatred and uses all her powers to annihilate them. If ever the Catholics should become a considerable majority, which in time will surely be the case, then will religious freedom in the Republic of the United States come to an end. Our enemies know how she treated heretics in the Middle Ages and how she treats them to-day where she has the power. We no more think of denying these historic facts than we do of blaming the Holy God and the princes of the Church for what they have thought fit to do."

It is remarkable that in his foot-notes generally Dr. Daniel Dorchester has taken great pains to mention distinctly the book, or pamphlet, or newspaper, with proper title and page or date, to which he refers or from which he professes to quote. But in this instance he omits all such reference whatever. Why this omission? Why not tell his readers when, where, on what occasion and in what discourse "Bishop Ryan, of Philadelphia" made this alleged "recent utterance," the exact words of which he pretends to quote? We challenge him to do it. We are familiar, we are in a position to be familiar with Archbishop Ryan's "utterances" since he came to Philadelphia, and we unhesitatingly and unqualifiedly pronounce the alleged "recent utterance" to be a base and impudent forgery. We denounce the writer as a reckless falsifier, and again we challenge him to cite even a sentence, or a line, from any of Archbishop Ryan's utterances, "recent" or not recent, that will furnish even a color of proof that the pretended quotation is genuine.

Archbishop Ryan's "recent utterances" have been many and frequent. They have attracted more than usual attention on the part of the general public. They have been sought for, published, noticed, and favorably commented on by the non-Catholic secular press, far and wide. Is it possible that such an "utterance," had it been made, could have remained unnoticed by the secular press, or if noticed would have escaped its indignant denunciation? No intelligent person will believe it.

All the real utterances, too, of Archbishop Ryan flatly contradict the ideas which this falsifier has attempted to foist upon him. Instead of holding that the Catholic Church is opposed to the freedom, either religious or political, secured to all citizens by the Constitution of the United States, and that the Church would put an end to that freedom if she could, Archbishop Ryan has repeatedly declared that the Catholics of the United States have good reasons for being ardently attached to our political institutions, because under those institutions they enjoy greater religious freedom than they do in Europe, and also because the Catholic Church in this country is less trammelled and less interfered

with, and is much more prosperous than it is under most of the Governments of European countries.

These ideas, too, he has not only expressed in this country, but also in Europe ; and notably in Rome, only a few months ago, in his address to the Sovereign Pontiff of the Church at the formal presentation of a copy of the Constitution of the United States by President Cleveland, in honor of the fiftieth ordination to the priesthood of Leo XIII. Owing to the warm, eloquent, outspoken eulogium pronounced upon our country and its institutions in that address, and its emphatic placing of peoples before and above princes, the address attracted attention everywhere in Europe as well as in this country.

In confirmation of this, we make the following brief quotations from that address :

" In Your Holiness's admirable Encyclical ' Immortale Dei,' you truly state that the Church is wedded to no particular form of civil government. Your favorite theologian, St. Thomas Aquinas, has written true and beautiful things concerning republicanism. In our American republic the Catholic Church is left perfectly free to act out her sacred and beneficent mission to the human race

" We beg Your Holiness, therefore, to bless this great country, which has achieved so much in a single century ; to bless the land discovered by your holy compatriot, Christopher Columbus ; to bless the prudent and energetic President of the United States of America ; and finally we ask, kneeling at your feet, that you bless ourselves and the people committed to our care."

In answer to Archbishop Ryan His Holiness Leo XIII. spoke as follows :

" As the Archbishop of Philadelphia has said, they (the Americans) enjoy full liberty in the true sense of the term, guaranteed by the Constitution—a copy of which is presented to me. Religion is there free to extend continually, more and more, the empire of Christianity, and the Church to develop her beneficent activities. As the Head of the Church, I owe my love and solicitude to all parts of the world, but I bear for America a very special affection. . . .

" Your country is great, with a future full of hope. Your nation is free. Your Government is strong, and the character of your President commands my highest admiration. It is for these reasons that the gift causes me the liveliest pleasure. It truly touches my heart and forces me, by a most agreeable impulse, to manifest to you my most profound sentiment of gratitude and esteem."

We add that Archbishop Ryan has never been supposed to be wanting in prudence or sagacity. On the contrary, the general public have given him credit for possessing these qualities in high degree. By their exercise, along with moderation and unaffected genial courtesy, he has won for himself hosts of friends among non-Catholics as well as Catholics. Yet had he made the utterance this unscrupulous falsifier and forger pretends he did, he would have furnished unmistakable proof of being idiotically stupid and utterly lacking discernment. For, such an utterance, like the sound of a shotted gun, would have echoed and reechoed far and wide, and would have brought down upon him swift and indignant denunciation from every quarter.

And now we still more effectively " nail to the counter " this base forgery, by giving its history. The pretended " recent utterance " of Archbishop Ryan is a greatly enlarged and newly coined version of an old and often exploded slander, originally gotten up against another person. Its history is this :

Nearly forty years ago—and long before any one could have foreseen that the Vatican Council would be convened, and that the infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff of the Church would be declared a dogma of the Catholic faith—a newspaper was published in St. Louis called the *Shepherd of the Valley*. Its editor was a Mr. Bakewell, a Catholic layman,

then a young man, who afterwards became a very distinguished citizen of St. Louis, and until a few years ago was Judge of the Court of Appeals. Referring to misrepresentations of the Catholic religion by its enemies, Judge Bakewell wrote in his paper as follows,—we give the exact words:

“If Catholics ever attain, which they surely will, though at a distant day, the immense numerical majority in the United States, religious liberty, as at present understood, will be at an end—so say our enemies.”

The sentence was mutilated and its meaning entirely changed by leaving out the words we have italicized. In this mutilated form it was published by anti-Catholic newspapers, as an expression of Judge Bakewell’s belief. The misrepresentation was exposed, and for a time passed out of notice. Soon, however, it was revived in an anti-Catholic publication; and it was attempted to fasten it on Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis. Again it was exposed. Then again it was revived and exposed some ten years ago in the *Catholic Standard*. Then it travelled to Australia and was attributed to Archbishop Ryan. It was contradicted and exposed by him by letter. It then travelled to Ireland, and was circulated by Presbyterians and Orangemen, and was again exposed. It came back to this country, and was attempted to be foisted again on Archbishop Ryan, then recently installed as Archbishop of Philadelphia, and with the evident intention of exciting prejudice against him in his new see. It was not, however, pretended to be a “recent utterance” of his, but an editorial utterance of his in the *Shepherd of the Valley*, in St. Louis, though at the alleged time, so far from being editor of that newspaper, he was not even in this country, but was in Europe. It was again thoroughly exposed in the *Catholic Standard* in 1886, both by its editor and in a published letter of Judge Bakewell.

Thus far we have written without having seen Archbishop Ryan, and supposing that we could not see him before this would appear in type, owing to his being with his clergy on their annual spiritual retreat. But since writing the foregoing we have succeeded in seeing him for a few minutes at the close of the first week’s retreat. And now we are authorized by him to declare in his name that the pretended “utterance” is a forgery—a FORGERY *in part and in whole*.

We add, in conclusion, that by a comparison of the alleged “recent utterance” with the garbled words of Judge Bakewell, published nearly forty years ago, the deliberate malice of the forgery will appear. Its conscienceless author has not only changed the language of the original misrepresentation, so as to give it a sharper and more venomous point, but has coined additional sentences, both preceding it and following it, so as to enlarge it into a paragraph, for the plain purpose of giving an appearance of plausibility to its pretended connection with the decree of “Papal Infallibility.”

MORES CATHOLICI; OR, AGES OF FAITH. By *Kenelm H. Digby*. Volume the First, containing Books I., II., III., and IV. New York: P. O’Shea, Publisher, 45 Warren Street. 1888.

Two editions of this work have been published; one of them in eleven duodecimo volumes, which appeared successively between 1831 and 1840; the other, in three volumes, royal octavo, in 1845–47. These two editions were quickly exhausted, and copies of them are so highly prized by their possessors that they are seldom offered for sale, and when thus offered are so quickly bought up by private collectors of books of special value that they are virtually beyond the reach even of the better educated of the general public. Mr. O’Shea, therefore, is rendering a

real and very important service to contemporaneous literature in publishing a new edition of this deservedly highly-prized work.

Its republication, too, at the present time, is very opportune. The tendency of our age is to underrate all that has been done in past times. This age, we are told, *ad nauseam*, is an advance upon all that has gone before it. The past is dead, the present only is living. Those who look to the past for wisdom have their eyes in the back of their head. They should steadily look forward, and employ their energies in gathering the untouched fresh materials which lie in exhaustless abundance all around them, and use only those materials in erecting new intellectual structures, instead of groping for stones already quarried and hewn to shape amid the dust and ashes and crumbling monuments of their ancestors.

This is all very well up to a certain point, and with proper qualifications. Yet it sorely needs such qualifications. The present age, though perfectly well satisfied with itself, has not yet obtained such an exhaustless wealth of self-acquired wisdom that it can afford to despise the accumulated treasures of former ages. Perhaps, too, its structures of learning and thought would be all the more durable if some of the massive stones that were quarried and shaped by the toil of ancient workmen, and have stood the test of time's destructive force, were incorporated into them. Modern rubble-work of pebbles and spauls, gathered at random and hastily joined together with untempered mortar, are not quite as enduring as are many of the monuments which attest the skill and might of the master-builders of times long past. It is wise, therefore, occasionally to glance behind us and study the past, as well as to look upon the immediate present. Too exclusive attention to the present will please our vanity, and inflate it. It will give us, too, more self-assurance. But of that we already have quite a sufficiency, unless we are entirely mistaken.

The work before us is a description of Christian life in the Middle Ages, taking as its clue and guiding principle the "beatitudes," pronounced by our Divine Lord, at the commencement of His "Sermon upon the Mount," as recorded by St. Matthew. It is a work of immense erudition, both comprehensive and minute. It lays under contribution the history, poetry, and philosophy of all ages and nations, gathering together the loftiest ideas of the world's thinkers and sages, and using them to illustrate its theme. It is a work, too, of searching analysis into the springs of human action, and the causes that tend to form and elevate human character, and of profound meditation upon the ways of God with man. To the thoughtful reader it is a veritable "book of wisdom." He will never weary of it. He can return to it again and again with pleasure, finding in it new beauties, and strengthening himself in good purposes by communing with its pure, devout spirit and elevated thoughts.

It has been alleged that the title of this work, "*Ages of Faith*," is misleading, in that it is not a faithful representation of the Middle Ages; that it might be properly styled, "*A Romance Founded on Facts of Mediæval History*;" that the author has clothed every object he presents in the rich and brilliant hues of his own lofty and prolific imagination; that society in the Middle Ages cannot be truly regarded as in its normal condition, nor was it, in its totality, really under the spiritual direction of the Church; that those ages were barbarous, cruel, ignorant, and corrupt.

But these charges are all based upon a total misconception of the intention and purpose of the work. The first part of its title, "*Mores*

Catholici," should have been a sufficient safeguard to those who have thus misconceived it. It is not intended to present a picture of mediæval ages in their non-Christian, but in their Christian, *Catholic*, aspects. And, as regards those aspects, it is a true picture, for the most prominent characteristic of them under those aspects was their *faith*. They were emphatically "Ages of Faith." In this respect they present a marked contrast with the skepticism, the infidelity, and disbelief of modern times. That there were barbarism, darkness both intellectual and moral, cruelty, and disobedience of the precepts of the Church, and that this disobedience often, among powerful secular princes and rulers, took the form of defiant resistance, every one knows who has any knowledge of those ages, and the author of the "*Ages of Faith*" would be the last to deny. But these facts do not in the least militate against the work, its purpose and intention. As we have already said, its purpose is to describe the *Christian* life of those ages, and its beneficent action upon human character in all the spheres in which human character reveals itself—domestic, social, political, industrial, intellectual, and artistic—and not the work of the devil, in his attempts to destroy that life, nor of the world, so far as it placed itself under the power of the devil. The very instances that are continually adduced—and they were many and constantly occurring—of cruelty, barbarity, and wicked disregard of the obligations of Christianity by Christian princes and rulers, and by persons below them in society, were plainly instances of disobedience to the *faith* which they *believed*, but which, yielding to temptations of ambition, lust, cupidity, or other sinful passions, they did not obey or practise.

We sum up our convictions respecting this admirable work in a few sentences borrowed from a brief sketch of its author. They are, that "no other work in our language presents so completely, so felicitously, from every point of view, the claims of the Catholic Church to the veneration, love, and obedience of every human being. It may be said to be a picture of the life of the Christian world, so accurately photographed that no feature is wanting that could be required to give due expression to the whole; in which the portraiture is so faithful that the inner life is expressed as well as the outer semblance."

The first volume of this republication of the "*Ages of Faith*," which is the only volume that has yet appeared, depicts the influence of the Christian life in actualizing the spirit of poverty, meekness, and mourning, as inculcated in the first three beatitudes. The typographical execution well accords with the intrinsic value of the contents.

It is to be hoped that Mr. O'Shea will receive such substantial encouragement through the sale of this volume as will induce him to persevere in his purpose to republish, in a uniform edition and in a style worthy of their great merit, all of Digby's works.

A LITERARY AND BIOGRAPHICAL HISTORY; or, Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics, from the Breach with Rome in 1534 to the Present Time. By Joseph Gillow. Vol. III. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Company.

The title of this work so fully indicates its general scope and purpose that further explanation seems needless. The volume before us extends from the letters "Gra" to "Kel." It contains, as we learn from the Preface, three hundred and forty-one biographical, one hundred and twenty subsidiary memoirs, and over twelve hundred bibliographical notices. To English Catholics, and the descendants of English Catholics, it cannot fail to be deeply interesting.

It is valuable, also, to students of English bibliography, as it contains the titles and short notices of numerous books, pamphlets, and manuscripts, the existence even of many of which is unknown except to a very few persons.

Many of the biographies have been compiled from letters and manuscripts and memoranda in the possession of various persons which have never been published, and from books and pamphlets that have long been out of print, and of which very few copies can be found. They throw a great deal of light upon many imperfectly known and controverted matters connected with the interior history of the times, particularly of those of the Tudors and the Stuarts. They bring to mind, too, in a way that no *ex professo* history of persecutions could do, the cold-blooded, deliberate malice of the persecutions to which English Catholics were subjected and the systematic cruelty with which they were hunted, fined, imprisoned, tortured, and butchered. The perusal of many of these biographies forcibly reminds us of the ancient heathen persecutions, but with this difference: Those persecutions were waged by idolatrous heathens who knew not the One True God, but the English Catholics were persecuted by those who sinned against light and knowledge, by persons who professed to be Christians and who carried on their persecutions in the name of Christ and His religion.

IRISH WONDERS. *The Ghosts, Giants, Pookas, Demons, Leprechawns, Banshees, Fairies, Witches, Widows, Old Maids, and Other Marvels of the Emerald Isle. Popular Tales as Told by the People.* By D. R. McAnally, Jr. Illustrated by H. R. Heaton. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. 1888.

The wonderful imaginative power and fruitfulness of the Celtic mind is not more fully exhibited in its poetry, its novels, and stories of scenes in real life and the exuberant imagery of its orators, than in legends and fanciful tales which people in the humbler walks of life delight in telling. Go where you will in Ireland, the story-teller is there, ready and willing to repeat his fanciful tale, with a wealth of rustic imagery and a dramatic force that trained and practised writers might envy.

The work before us presents this phase of unwritten Celtic literature. The materials were collected during a recent lengthy visit to Ireland during which, the writer states, he traversed every county from end to end and was in constant and familiar association with the peasant tenantry.

The task which the writer undertook was evidently a congenial one and one which he possessed the requisite qualifications to well perform. The original spirit and wit, humor, pathos and imagery of the legends and stories are well preserved, as are also the distinctive dialect and pronunciation of the Irish peasantry.

The volume, with its striking and characteristic illustrations, will be a very acceptable present to children, who will pore over its pages with delight. And we may add that children, too, of older growth will find amusement and pleasant relaxation in them.

THE PERFECT RELIGIOUS, ACCORDING TO THE RULE OF ST. AUGUSTINE; Or, Instructions for all Religious; Referring Principally to the Constitutions of Religious Ursulines. By Father Francis Xavier Weninger, Priest of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the German by a Member of the Ursuline Community of St. Mary's, Waterford. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1888.

Among the many Monastic Rules which have been approved by the Church, the Rule of St. Augustine is especially distinguished by remarkable proofs of the virtue it possesses to lead souls to the highest

perfection. It admirably combines evangelic austerity with the sweetness of spirit of our Blessed Redeemer. It seems particularly suited to those Orders of Religious Women who, while laboring for their own sanctification, devote themselves to the instruction of youth. For these and other like reasons the Rule of St. Augustine has been adopted, in preference to other rules, by many communities belonging to different religious orders.

Owing, however, to its brevity, the need of explanations and comments having regard to existing times and circumstances has long been felt. This want the author undertakes to supply in the little volume before us. He has taken the Constitution of Ursuline Communities as the ground-work of his commentary, but has aimed also at making it suitable to the Religious in kindred orders.

From the examination we have been able to give the work we think it is not only well adapted to subserve the purposes for which the author immediately intends it, but also that it will be very useful to the laity as a book for devout reading and meditation.

ENGLISH HISTORY BY CONTEMPORARY WRITERS. Vol. I. Edward III. and his Wars, 1327-1360. Extracts from the Chronicles of Froissart, Jéhan Le Bel, Knighton, Adam of Murimuth, Robert of Aresburg, the Chronicle of Sauercost, the State Papers and other Contemporary Records. Arranged and Edited by *W. J. Ashley, M.A.*, Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford. Vol. II. The Misrule of Henry III, 1236-1251. Extracts from the writings of Matthew Paris, Robert Grosseteste, Adam of Marsh, etc. Selected and arranged by the Rev. W. H. Hutton, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1887.

These two works are the first that have been published of a series of small volumes, each one independent of the others, and which are intended to furnish life-like pictures of the periods they respectively embrace in the history of England. They aim at telling the story of their times in the words of writers who lived in those times, and were not simply spectators of their events, but took an active part in them.

The plan is unquestionably a very judicious one, but it is one also which requires very great care and a high degree of impartiality on the part of the person selecting the extracts from contemporaneous writers from which each volume is made up. In the two volumes before us the spirit of the times of which they treat, and the habits and prevailing ideas and modes of thought of the people of England during those times, are clearly brought to view.

THE HOUSEHOLD LIBRARY OF IRELAND'S POETS; with full and choice selections from the Irish-American Poets, and a complete department of authentic biographical notes. Collected and edited by *Daniel Connolly*. Published by the editor at 28 Union Square, New York.

This large and handsome volume must have been the result of several years of industrious research and toil on the part of the editor, whose pre-eminent fitness for the task he set himself is shown in the result of his labors. His plan is not entirely original, being simply an expansion of that adopted forty years ago by the late Edward Hayes, whose "Ballad Poetry of Ireland" was long the household book on the subject for lovers of Irish literature. But Mr. Connolly covers a much wider field, taking in, besides more than the last generation in Ireland itself, the Anglo-Irish and Irish-American writers, while Hayes confined himself to those of Irish birth and using Irish themes. The result is simply astonishing in regard to the number of versifiers whose poems he places before us

—nearly two hundred and sixty named authors, besides twenty poems by anonymous writers; and others are coming into prominence now, both in Ireland and abroad, who, of course, do not appear in his anthology. The book is also embellished with a dozen fine portraits. Similar in plan to Hayes' work is particularly the arrangement according to subjects; but here, under each of the thirteen headings, we have almost enough poems to fill a small duodecimo volume. So thoroughly has Mr. Connolly done his work that future compilers need only supplement it by selections from the effusions of new writers.

ABANDONMENT; Or, Absolute Surrender to Divine Providence. Posthumous work of Rev. J. P. de Caussade, S.J. Revised and Corrected by Rev. H. Ramière, S.J. Translated from the French Edition by Miss Ella McMahon. New York, Cincinnati and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers. London: R. Washburne. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

This is an ascetical work, which is specially intended for those who are striving to attain evangelical perfection, though a thoughtful and discriminating perusal of it will not be without profit to other devout souls. It is published with the *imprimatur* of the Most Rev. Archbishop of New York.

It is on a subject which requires to be handled with great care, for if misunderstood it may lead to pernicious errors. And, indeed, this danger is not a mere possibility. For the heresy of quietism which arose in the seventeenth century, and by its specious sophisms misled many well-meaning souls, and even, for a time, the pious Fenelon, claimed to be based on perfect abandonment to God.

For these reasons Father Ramière has prefaced Father Caussade's treatise with a long introduction, in which he explains Father Caussade's doctrine, and shows that, properly understood, the rules he lays down do not involve the dangers to which we have referred.

THE CHAIR OF PETER; Or, the Papacy Considered in its Institutions, Development and Organization, and in the Benefits which, for over Eighteen Centuries, it has Conferred on Mankind. By John Nicholas Murphy, Roman Count. Third Edition, with events and statistics brought down to the present time. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1888.

It was a happy inspiration that led the author to compile this work, which is a review of Church History as embodied in the Papacy, a setting forth in bold relief of the principal events in the development of Christian civilization. The fact that the work has reached a third edition, the second of the popular form, is proof of the fact that it has satisfied a widespread demand on the part of the reading Catholic public. As the contents of the volume have already been dwelt upon in detail, at the times when the former editions appeared, we need not repeat them here; suffice it now to say that the narrative has been continued to date—the history of the Culturkampf has been completed, and the other recent events of Leo XIII's pontificate are treated of in the clear and strong style of which the author is a master.

EMANUEL, THE SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD. By Rev. John Gmeiner, Professor in St. Thomas' Seminary, St. Paul, Minn., Milwaukee: Hoffman Bros. 1888.

This is the third instalment of a popular defence of Christian doctrines which the author began some years ago, the first volume being entitled "Modern Scientific Views and Christian Doctrines Compared," and the second "The Spirits of Darkness and their Manifestations on Earth; or, Ancient and Modern Spiritualism." The work now before

us is fully deserving of the great popularity won by its predecessors. In it the author answers the questions, "What think you of Christ? Whose Son is He?" And in doing so meets the various attempts made in our day to undermine the Christian Faith. As far as was possible for him he has consulted the very latest literature of his subject. A vast amount of learning is here condensed within the compass of a little over one hundred pages.

THE LIFE OF ST. BRIDGET OF SWEDEN. By the late *F. J. M. Partridge*. London : Burns & Oates. New York : The Catholic Publication Society Co.

This Life of St. Bridget of Sweden is a condensation from the German work published a few years ago at Mayence. It is based upon careful research, and its perusal will afford both instruction and pleasure to the reader. It describes the life and labors of one who from infancy was marked out by God for the reception of spiritual favors, who was an example of piety and devotion as a Christian wife and mother, and who, during her widowhood, endured many sufferings with exemplary patience and unshaken confidence in God, and abounded in charitable works. She lived in one of the stormiest periods of the Church's history ; made pilgrimages to Rome and to the Holy Land, and traversed almost all Italy. Incidentally, much interesting information is given in the narrative of her life respecting the condition of Christianity at that time in Sweden and different parts of Italy, and respecting the Popes and secular princes of that period.

CONQUESTS OF OUR HOLY FAITH ; or, TESTIMONIES OF DISTINGUISHED CONVERTS. By *James J. Treacy*. New York and Cincinnati : Fr. Pustet & Co.

The compiler of this work is already favorably known to the public as editor of two similar volumes, one of poetry, "Catholic Flowers from Protestant Gardens," and the other of prose selections, "Tributes of Protestant Writers." The present effort is even more successful than these. With great care and prudent judgment the selections have been made ; so that not only are nearly all the writers chosen of the first rank, but besides no two of the extracts from their writings treat of the same subject. There are over seventy articles in the book, and as many authors as there are articles. It is an excellent little work to place in the hands of those seeking religious truth.

THE CRIME AGAINST IRELAND. By *J. Ellen Foster*. With a Preface, by *John Boyle O'Reilly*. Boston : D. Lathrop & Company.

This book is not a rehash of documents, arguments, etc., about Ireland already published and with which the public are already familiar. On the contrary, though it goes over an old subject, it has all the freshness of originality. It is a republication in book form of recent letters to the Boston *Journal*, and within a brief compass states the case of Ireland and shows that the only true remedy is legislative independence, with a clearness and force we have rarely seen equalled.

MONTH OF ST. JOSEPH ; or, Practical Meditations for Each Day of the Month of March. By the *Abbé Berlioux*. Translated from the French by *Eleanor Cholmeley*. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son. 1888.

This is an excellent little manual of devotions in honor of St. Joseph, specially arranged for every day in March. The meditations are brief and concise, the points they comprise are clearly set forth. Each meditation is followed by a short prayer and a brief example, illustrating the special subject proposed for consideration.

MEMOIRS OF A SERAPH. From the French of *M. l'Abbé G. Chardon*, Vicar-General of Clermont, author of Memoirs of a Guardian Angel. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1888.

This book is a collection of all that is known, or conjectured on good grounds, on the subject which it treats of, by the wisest and holiest of the great teachers of the Church; among them, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, and Suarez. It is full of Catholic theology and philosophy, presented in a form that is simple and natural and easy of comprehension.

MODERN NOVELS AND NOVELISTS. A Book of Criticism. By *Maurice Francis Egan, A.M.* New York: William H. Sadlier.

This neat little volume, which is made up mainly of selections from articles contributed from month to month to the *Catholic World*, is a useful guide for readers of light literature. They are told here, in a pleasant way, what books to avoid as well as what ones out of the myriads that are constantly put in the market they may peruse with profit.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

ELEMENTS OF ECCLESIASTICAL LAW. Compiled with Reference to the "Const. Apostolice Sedis" of Pope Pius IX., the Council of the Vatican, and the Latest Decisions of the Roman Congregations. Adapted especially to the Discipline of the Church in the United States, according to the recent Instruction "Cum Magnopere," and the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. By *Rev. S. B. Smith, D.D.*, Vol. III. Ecclesiastical Punishments. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1888.

THE BIRTHDAY PARTY AND OTHER STORIES. A Book for Girls. Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co.

A THOUGHT FROM THE BENEDICTINE SAINTS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR. Translated from the French by *Helen O'Donnell*, author of "Hand-book for Altar Societies," etc. New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: Beuziger Brothers.

THE STUDENT OF BLENHEIM FOREST. By *Anna Hanson Dorsey*. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1888.

ZOE'S DAUGHTER. By *Anna Hanson Dorsey*. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1888.

THE FATE OF THE DANE AND OTHER STORIES. By *Anna Hanson Dorsey*. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1888.

SIX SERMONS ON DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART. By *Rev. Ewald Bierbaum, D.D.* Translated from the German by Miss Ella McMahon. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1888.

STORIES FOR FIRST COMMUNICANTS; for the Time Before and After Holy Communion. Drawn from the Best Authorities. By *Rev. Dr. Joseph A. Keller*. Translated, with Permission of the Author, by Frances M. Kemp. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

JUBILEE-TIDE IN ROME. By John George Cox. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co.

THE LIFE AND GLORIES OF ST. JOSEPH, HUSBAND OF MARY, FOSTER FATHER OF JESUS, AND PATRON OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH. By Edward Healy Thompson, M.A. London and New York: Burns & Oates. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1888.

HENRY VIII. AND THE ENGLISH MONASTERIES. An Attempt to Illustrate the History of their Suppression. By *Francis Aidon Gosquet*, Monk of the Order of St. Benedict, sometime Prior of St. Gregory's Monastery, Downside, Bath. Vol. I. John Hodges: London. Received for notice from the Catholic Publication Society Company, New York.

PALESTINE IN THE TIME OF CHRIST. By *Edmond Stapfer, D.D.*, Professor in the Protestant Theological Faculty of Paris. Translated by Annie Harwood Holmden. Third edition, with Map and Plans. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son.

MARIA MAGNIFICATA. Short Meditations for a Month on Our Lady's Life. By *Richard F. Clarke, S.J.* New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

70746

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

**THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM**

